Exhibit H

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 2 of 233 PageID: 48037

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD

KIMBERLEE WILLIAMS, et al., Plaintiffs,

vs.

BASF CATALYSTS, LLC, et al., Defendants.

------Monday, January 15, 2018

Stenographic Transcript of Oral Argument, taken at the law offices of Ballard Spahr, 1735 Market Street, 48th Floor, Philadelphia, PA, before Robert J. Boccolini, Certified Court Reporter, on the above date, commencing at 10:30 a.m., there being present:

BALLARD SPAHR, LLP
Woodland Falls Corporate Park
210 Lake Drive East, Suite 200
Cherry Hill, NJ 08002
BY: ROBERTO RIVERA-SOTO, ESQ.
SPECIAL MASTER
WILLIAM P. REILEY, ESQ.

TATE & TATE
Certified Court Reporters
The Ironstone Village
520 Stokes Road, Suite C-1
Medford, New Jersey 08055
(856) 983-8484 - (800) 636-8283
www.tate-tate.com

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 3 of 233 PageID: 48038

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 2
1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
2	GOVERN DI LIGHTELLI A DOTTI DE
3	COHEN, PLACITELLA & ROTH, PC Two Commerce Square, Suite 2900
3	2001 Market Street
4	Philadelphia, PA 19103
	BY: CHRISTOPHER M. PLACITELLA, ESQ.
5	HARRY M. ROTH, ESQ.
_	MICHAEL COREN, ESQ.
6	Attorneys for Plaintiffs
7	KIRKLAND & ELLIS, LLP
8	655 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
	Washington, D.C. 20005-5793
9	BY: PETER A. FARRELL, ESQ.
	EUGENE F. ASSAF, P.C.
10	Attorneys for Defendant BASF Catalysts, LLC
11	CONNELL FOLEY LID
12	CONNELL FOLEY, LLP 56 Livingston Avenue
12	Roseland, NJ 07068
13	BY: ROBERT E RYAN, ESQ.
	Attorneys for Cahill Defendants
14	
15	LEVY KONIGSBERG, LLP
16	800 Third Avenue, 11th Floor New York, NY 10022
	BY: BRENDAN E. LITTLE, ESQ.
17	Attorneys for Defendants Thomas W. Bevan and
	Bevan & Associates LPA, Inc.,
18	and James F. Early
19	THE HOUSING DARFEGERANTS.
20	TELEPHONIC PARTICIPANTS:
U	ROBINSON MILLER, LLC
21	One Newark Center, 19th Floor
	Newark, NJ 07102
22	BY: JUSTIN T. QUINN, ESQ.
0.3	Attorneys for Defendant BASF Catalysts, LLC
23 24	VINCENT MONTALTO ECO
∠ <del>'</del>	VINCENT MONTALTO, ESQ. Senior Litigation Counsel
25	BASF Catalysts, LLC

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 4 of 233 PageID: 48039

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 3
1	TELEPHONIC PARTICIPANTS CONTINUED:
2	
3	KIRKLAND & ELLIS, LLP 655 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
4	Washington, D.C. 20005-5793
4	<b>BY:</b> DANIEL A. BRESS, ESQ. <b>Att</b> orneys for Defendant BASF Catalysts, LLC
5	
6	WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY, LP 725 12th Street N.W.
7	Washington, DC 20005
8	BY: CASSANDRA B. FIELDS, ESQ. Attorneys for Cahill Defendants
9	Accorneys for Cantill Defendancs
9	MARINO, TORTORELLA & BOYLE, PC
10	437 Southern Boulevard Chatham, NJ 07929
11	BY: JOHN A. BOYLE, ESQ.
12	Attorneys for Defendant Arthur A. Dornbusch
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 5 of 233 PageID: 48040

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 4
1	SPECIAL MASTER: Good morning, everyone.
2	Happy Martin Luther King Day to everybody.
3	Could I get the appearances of counsel,
4	starting with the plaintiffs, please.
5	MR. PLACITELLA: Christopher Placitella
6	on behalf of the plaintiffs.
7	MR. COREN: Michael Coren on behalf of
8	the plaintiffs.
9	MR. ROTH: Harry Roth on behalf of the
10	plaintiffs.
11	MR. FARRELL: Peter Farrell on behalf of
12	defendant BASF.
13	MR. ASSAF: Gene Assaf for BASF.
14	MR. RYAN: Robert Ryan for the Cahill
15	defendants.
16	MS. FIELDS: Cassandra Fields, Williams
17	& Connolly, on behalf of the Cahill defendants.
18	MR. LITTLE: Brendan Little on behalf of
19	the Bevan firm.
20	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Miss Fields,
21	you got a little bit ahead of us, but that's okay.
22	Anyone else who's on the own phone?
23	MR. BOYLE: John Boyle for defendant
24	Arthur Dornbusch.
25	SPECIAL MASTER: Welcome, Mr. Boyle.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 6 of 233 PageID: 48041

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 5
1	MR. BOYLE: Thank you.
2	MR. BRESS: Dan Bress for BASF, your
3	Honor.
4	SPECIAL MASTER: You're the one I can
5	thank for the e-mail yesterday afternoon.
6	MR. PLACITELLA: Yes, thank you.
7	SPECIAL MASTER: Anyone else?
8	MR. QUINN: Good morning, your Honor.
9	This is Justin Quinn for BASF.
10	SPECIAL MASTER: Good morning, Mr.
11	Quinn.
12	Anyone else?
13	MR. MONTALTO: Your Honor, Vince
14	Montalto, in-house counsel for BASF.
15	SPECIAL MASTER: I'm sorry, can you give
16	me your name again, please?
17	MR. MONTALTO: Sure. It's Vince
18	Montalto. I'm senior litigation counsel at BASF.
19	SPECIAL MASTER: Anyone else? Okay.
20	Going once. Going twice.
21	All right. We have what are two
22	motions. And then we also have a little bit of a
23	controversy concerning the proposed submissions that
24	BASF and/or the Cahill Gordon defendants wish to make
25	in response to plaintiffs' motion concerning the

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 7 of 233 PageID: 48042

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al.
Oral Argument

	Page 6
1	crime fraud exception and/or Kozlov exceptions to the
2	attorney/client privilege.
3	I'm going to do this a little bit out of
4	order and I'm going to start with the BASF motion to
5	compel the production of what's now being called the
6	Bevan database. And let me start with that.
7	On December 15, 2017, BASF filed a
8	motion to compel what is now called the Bevan
9	database that was docketed at ECF number 383. There
10	are three things in specific that BASF is asking that
11	the database contain.
12	The first one is the identity of the
13	referring attorney. Second is whether the Bevan
14	plaintiffs qualified for or received payment from any
15	asbestos settlement trust. And number three, any
16	compensation that was received by the Bevan
17	plaintiffs
18	BASF asserts that in this motion the
19	plaintiffs in this case were interlopers when Bevan
20	had already agreed to produce the databases.
21	BASF wants the database entries produced
22	unredacted save for personal identifiers, social
23	numbers, addresses, the like.
24	On December the 20th, ECF number 390, a
25	scheduling order was entered in respect of the

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 8 of 233 PageID: 48043

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 7 1 opposition and replies. 2 On December 27, 2017, under ECF number 394, the plaintiffs filed an opposition saying that 3 4 they had only -- that the agreement in respect of the 5 Bevan database was only as to a process, not as to 6 the result, that much of what it was being requested 7 was barred by one of the October 26, 2017, orders, 8 and that the Ohio disclosure statute is inapplicable, 9 that the probate information is irrelevant, and that the prior ruling that was made in respect of how many 10 files from the Bevan files were to be produced was 11 12 not based on burdens 13 The plaintiffs also assert that the BASF defendants are not entitled to the identity of the 14 15 referring lawyers because it is a trade secret and 16 that the motion prematurely assumes the nature of the 17 putative class. 18 On December 27, under ECF number 395, 19 Bevan filed its opposition -- and when I say Bevan, I 20 mean both the firm and Mr. Bevan -- that incorporates 2.1 the objections that were filed by plaintiffs, that 22 ask that the production be defined by the class 23 certification motion that has not yet been filed, and 24 that the production be subject to a Rule 502(d) 25 order.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 9 of 233 PageID: 48044

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 8
1	According to Bevan, the agreement only
2	was to discuss the production, that the limitations
3	they're proposing are reasonable, that
4	confidentiality, proprietary business information,
5	information about parties who are not part of the
6	class should not be subject to disclosure, that the
7	entire database is an attorney work product, and that
8	it is a, quote, relational database containing
9	approximately 350 data fields, unquote.
10	I wish I knew what that meant, which is
11	why I wrote it down verbatim.
12	Bevan also says that the referral
13	sources are proprietary and not relevant and that, 2,
14	it was barred by the prior October 26, 2017, order
15	that is at ECF number 367.
16	On January the 3rd, 2018, under ECF 398,
17	BASF filed its reply. And it basically says that
18	what's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.
19	If BASF was required to and did produce its database,
20	likewise the Bevan database should be presented. It
21	basically repeats the arguments that are set forth in
22	its initial submission and says that an appropriate
23	protective order cures any trade secret claim.
24	Normally I would then move to the movant
25	and say: What do you think?

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 10 of 233 PageID: 48045

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 9
1	But I'm going to do things a little bit
2	differently today.
3	Mr. Little, you're here representing
4	Bevan.
5	MR. LITTLE: Correct.
б	SPECIAL MASTER: What do you want us to
7	do?
8	MR. LITTLE: Well, first of all, I want
9	to correct I think what you recited about our
10	position.
11	I mean, first of all, we're taking the
12	position that the entire database, regardless of what
13	was offered in the meet and confer process, is work
14	product and should not be produced and that really
15	the burden is on BASF to show why they need it. And
16	they haven't met that burden. So
17	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, get past that,
18	because I'm going to find that they have.
19	So do how do we go about curing your
20	concerns?
21	MR. LITTLE: Well, I mean, the proposal
22	that was made by the plaintiffs with the Bevan firm's
23	input I think gives BASF everything that they need.
24	And I think that the three categories of fields that
25	they have a dispute that there's a dispute about,

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

	Page 10
1	and they're covered by prior rulings of the Court,
2	nothing has changed to alter that ruling regarding
3	settlement information.
4	There's no relevance or need for the
5	referring attorney. I don't see how that relates
6	either to the merits of the underlying case or the
7	issues or elements in the claims made by plaintiffs
8	in this case.
9	And in regard to the last category of
10	information, I mean, the fact that some of those
11	trust documents may be public under a 2011 law, I
12	don't see how that puts that information in a
13	different category than the other settlement
14	information the Court's previously ruled on.
15	So in summary, I think that the proposal
16	that was made by the plaintiffs was reasonable.
17	However, we still take the position for
18	the record that the entire database is work product.
19	And I think it's important to look at
20	what this is, because we are all attorneys and we can
21	all appreciate that a database containing information
22	about that firm's clients that was largely derived
23	from information provided by those clients and
24	medical practitioners, to order that to be produced,
25	especially without the presence of those clients in
1	

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 12 of 233 PageID: 48047

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 11 1 this lawsuit at this time is really an unprecedented 2 and scary thought. I mean, every law firm maintains 3 4 databases. It's how in modern litigation information 5 is organized and exchanged. And it's no different 6 than an internal memorandum about a case. 7 This is information that was selected by 8 the attorneys at the Bevan firm or at the direction 9 of the Bevan firm because of its importance to all of its asbestos cases. 10 So we're not unfortunately giving up any 11 12 ground on the position that the entire database is 13 work product and is protected and that it also contains significant attorney/client privilege 14 15 information. SPECIAL MASTER: Now, tell me more about 16 17 this database. I assume it's some form of 18 spreadsheet that has categories and has information 19 in respect of each category. Is that correct? 20 MR. LITTLE: I'm glad that you asked. 2.1 My understanding is that that is not correct. When 22 I say that it is a relational database, it is a 23 proprietary software that is similar to Microsoft 24 Access in that it contains database -- several 25 different databases and is able to present that

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 information through an interface and produce reports
- 2 that are then essentially in spreadsheet form.
- 3 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Okay. But the net
- 4 result of what would be produced, if it's ordered to
- 5 be produced, would be some form of spreadsheet,
- 6 correct?
- 7 MR. LITTLE: Correct. That is an
- 8 output option.
- 9 And one other point about the database
- 10 that I want to emphasize, that it contains
- 11 information for current and former clients, including
- 12 clients that are not part of the class even as it's
- 13 broadly pled in the current operative complaint.
- And so, you know, to be able to do what
- 15 BASF asks, which is essentially to provide a copy or
- 16 access to the database, is simply not possible.
- 17 **SPECIAL MASTER:** I don't understand the
- 18 not possible part.
- 19 MR. LITTLE: Well, because as far as I
- 20 know, there's no way to limit access to just the
- 21 clients that are part of this litigation.
- 22 SPECIAL MASTER: Are you telling me that
- 23 someone can't produce a spreadsheet and then take out
- 24 from that spreadsheet the names of people who are not
- 25 part of this class and would never be part of this

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 14 of 233 PageID: 48049

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 13
1	class, regardless of how it's defined?
2	MR. LITTLE: That is possible.
3	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
4	MR. LITTLE: But in terms of providing a
5	copy and this may be a misunderstanding about what
6	was contained in the database when we were having our
7	meet and confer discussion, but the comparison is I
8	think the Cahill database, an entire copy was
9	provided or will be provided for the plaintiffs to
10	use or to peruse at their will.
11	In this case, providing a copy of the
12	software that allows the Bevan firm to access
13	information in the database is not possible. But
14	producing some sort of spreadsheet report from the
15	database that contains a limited subset of that
16	information is a possibility.
17	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Mr. Placitella,
18	we're going backwards today.
19	MR. PLACITELLA: Okay. Well, I'll ask
20	for your patience because I heard your preliminary
21	thoughts and I feel compelled to make a record for
22	appeal.
23	SPECIAL MASTER: Please.
24	MR. PLACITELLA: In terms of our being
25	an interloper
1	

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 15 of 233 PageID: 48050

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 14
1	SPECIAL MASTER: I didn't those
2	weren't my words.
3	MR. PLACITELLA: I understand.
4	SPECIAL MASTER: I try to be as honest
5	in saying what the parties' positions are as I try
6	to tone them down a little bit, but other than
7	that
8	MR. PLACITELLA: In our position as
9	class counsel we have the duty and a right to protect
10	the rights of the putative class members.
11	SPECIAL MASTER: Granted. You don't
12	have to spend any more time on that point.
13	MR. PLACITELLA: So a number of points
14	for the record.
15	There is no right to discovery
16	concerning absent class members and certainly not
17	putative class members.
18	Bevan's clients are not parties to this
19	case at this point. They are putative class
20	members. They're not even absent class members as
21	certification has not been granted.
22	Putative class members have not even
23	availed themselves at this point and don't even know
24	that the case exists. The request is premature.
25	So let's say for example the case gets

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 certified and it's only certified on a C4 basis on an
- 2 issues class. That individual damage information
- 3 would only become relevant at the time the people --
- 4 if they decide to avail themselves of that.
- 5 So really, until they even see what the
- 6 certification brief looks like, their request is
- 7 premature.
- 8 There's also no right to confidential
- 9 information of putative class members. Filing of a
- 10 class does not waive the privilege of a putative
- 11 class member.
- 12 Suppose somebody decides to opt out.
- 13 They're a putative class member or an absent class
- 14 member. There's no law that says that just by being
- 15 a potential member of a class that you're waiving
- 16 your right to privilege.
- 17 We did not agree with this Court's order
- 18 concerning the production of the 30 files, the Bevan
- 19 files. And in order to move the case forward, it was
- 20 our belief and it's still our belief that Bevan is
- 21 not ethically permitted to turn over those files
- 22 without the clients' permission. That is supported
- 23 by an ethics opinion that Rothenberg provided to the
- 24 Court. I believe it's also supported by RPC 1.6(a).
- 25 Bevan, in order to --

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 17 of 233 PageID: 48052

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	D. 16
1	Page 16  SPECIAL MASTER: But bear with me for a
2	moment, Mr. Placitella, because I'm having a little
3	bit of a Groundhog Day moment. Okay.
4	Haven't we been through this before?
5	And wasn't that decision made in October, which means
6	the time for review of it is long past.
7	MR. PLACITELLA: I'm not asking for a
8	review of that decision.
9	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
10	MR. PLACITELLA: I'm saying I didn't
11	agree with it.
12	SPECIAL MASTER: I understand you didn't
13	agree with it. But you made your record then. And
14	believe me, you want to make a record, you can have
15	all the time in the world to make your own record
16	today. I will never infringe on that. But that's
17	plowed over ground.
18	MR. PLACITELLA: I understand. But
19	here's my point. The point is in order to move the
20	case forward, Mr. Bevan went and got permission and
21	decided for the 30 files that's how we'll handle it.
22	Now, if he's forced to turn over his
23	database, then he arguably has to go get permission
24	under the ethical rules from everybody in that
25	database pursuant to RPC 1.6(a), from his own ethics
i	

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 18 of 233 PageID: 48053

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 17
1	advice. And I don't think that he's willing to do
2	that and I don't think he should be compelled to do
3	that.
4	SPECIAL MASTER: Is that true even if a
5	Federal Rule of Evidence 502(d) order is entered?
6	MR. PLACITELLA: I don't think the
7	502(d) order trumps RPC 1.6(a).
8	But there's also no right to law firm
9	work product where that law firm is not a party.
10	And the database for
11	SPECIAL MASTER: I'm sorry, I don't
12	understand.
13	MR. PLACITELLA: Mr. Bevan
14	SPECIAL MASTER: Stop for a moment.
15	MR. PLACITELLA: Sure.
16	SPECIAL MASTER: Help me understand. I
17	don't understand the basis upon which you say that a
18	law firm that is not a party cannot be compelled to
19	produce its work product. What's the authority for
20	that proposition?
21	MR. PLACITELLA: Well, we looked high
22	and low for a case that was like this where a
23	non-party law firm was compelled to turn over its
24	database of client information that was the product
25	of a lot of analysis and synthesis.

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 19 of 233 PageID: 48054

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 18 1 In this case this database is 2 comprised -- I checked -- of 415 separate fields 3 that are the product of analysis and synthesis by the 4 people at the Bevan law firm. I could not find a 5 single case anywhere where a court had ordered that 6 kind of discovery. 7 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, you have me at a 8 disadvantage, because I don't know what's in this 9 Okay. All I know is what I've been told. database. 10 And I assumed, and maybe that's my mistake, that it was going to be something that was 11 12 akin to the BASF database, which was simply a 13 spreadsheet. Did I get that wrong or --14 MR. PLACITELLA: Probably on both 15 accounts. BASF's was not simply a spreadsheet. SPECIAL MASTER: Well, that's what was 16 17 shown to me. 18 MR. PLACITELLA: It was a relational 19 database. And it was not BASF's database. It was 20 Cahill's. 2.1 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Well, whoever it was, 22 the simple fact of the matter is that I was shown a 23 spreadsheet and I assumed that I was being shown that 24 for a reason. 25 MR. PLACITELLA: But there is a

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 significant difference, I submit, between the
- 2 database that Cahill turned over, who is a party, and
- 3 Mr. Bevan's position representing putative class
- 4 members and the information that's in there. That
- 5 is clear work product.
- 6 And I haven't found a case anywhere that
- 7 would require that, especially given the issues of
- 8 privilege at stake.
- 9 I also read that somehow we were getting
- 10 in the way of a deal that was made with Mr. Bevan.
- 11 And that's not --
- 12 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Just ignore that.
- 13 Okay. I ignored it. You'd do well to ignore it too.
- 14 MR. PLACITELLA: But on the base that
- 15 was something that Bevan and BASF was trying to work
- 16 out.
- 17 It's not a place where we start from.
- 18 BASF rejected that offer of compromise. From our
- 19 perspective, they start from ground zero. They
- 20 don't have a right to any of it, absent some kind of
- 21 fair compromise by Mr. Bevan.
- 22 BASF overreached and now they should be
- 23 stuck with overreaching.
- Now, here's the important part. The
- 25 discovery that's sought here by BASF and Cahill is

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 totally not necessary and redundant. BASF already
- 2 has virtually all of the information except for
- 3 settlement information and referring counsel
- 4 information that's in the Bevan database. BASF has
- 5 scanned and it's word searchable every single case
- 6 that they were involved with. That includes for
- 7 every case. And I wrote it down. It's far more
- 8 complete than actually what Bevan has.
- 9 For each client they have all of the
- 10 pleadings, they have the letters between themselves
- 11 and Mr. Bevan, they have the clients' medical
- 12 records, they have expert reports that were submitted
- 13 by Bevan, they have depositions that were taken of
- 14 the Bevan clients, they have the motions that were
- 15 filed in the case.
- 16 And the database that they have for
- 17 purposes of what they've categorized and what they've
- 18 extracted, their database includes the following
- 19 information: The disease that each plaintiff sued
- 20 for, not just Bevan but every plaintiff in the United
- 21 States, the date of the diagnosis, the docket number
- 22 and case name for each, every cause of action that
- 23 was asserted --
- 24 SPECIAL MASTER: I don't mean to cut you
- 25 short, but what you're telling me is that they

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 already have the information and it's not necessary
- 2 to require that somebody else produce it because they
- 3 already have it?
- 4 MR. PLACITELLA: That's exactly right.
- 5 But let me just finish for the record.
- 6 SPECIAL MASTER: All right. Please.
- 7 MR. PLACITELLA: Okay.
- 8 SPECIAL MASTER: I just want to make
- 9 sure I'm getting your point.
- 10 MR. PLACITELLA: Absolutely correct.
- 11 They have the plaintiffs' employer, the claimed root
- 12 of exposure, every hospital where the plaintiff went,
- 13 a list of all the plaintiffs' doctors, the
- 14 plaintiffs' smoking history, the plaintiffs' family
- 15 members, the plaintiffs' military history.
- 16 They have a list of every other
- 17 defendant in the case. They have a list of every
- 18 product sold by every other defendant in the case.
- 19 They have every doctor who was ever deposed in the
- 20 cases. They have every brief that was filed in the
- 21 case, whether it was filed by them, the plaintiff, or
- 22 a co-defendant. They have every plaintiff and every
- 23 witness that was deposed. And they have a review
- 24 that was done by their own experts of the medical
- 25 information supplied by the plaintiff.

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 23 of 233 PageID: 48058

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 22 1 So before we even think about making Mr. 2 Bevan have to go through what he needs to go through to order in order to comply with his ethical 3 4 responsibilities and the burden that would take, I 5 submit that the Court should take a hard look at the 6 Cahill database and see what is in there, because 7 it's everything you could ever think of. It is very, 8 very thorough. 9 **SPECIAL MASTER:** But see, you have to 10 help me on that, because I may get the numbers wrong. 11 But I thought the last time we were here 12 and we talked about the Cahill Gordon database, what 13 I was told was that it was incomplete. And we weren't talking about the substantive entries. 14 We were talking about actual number of participants in 15 16 it that, even though we were talking about -- and I 17 think the number I was given was between 15 and 18 18,000 potential plaintiffs, that the list only had 19 300 names on it or something like that. 20 Did I get that wrong, Mr. Roth? 2.1 I think, your Honor, and Mr. MR. ROTH: 22 Farrell can correct me, we were talking about the --23 there was a number of Rothenberg clients that I believe was 1,800, and there are 300 who show up on 24 25 the Cahill database.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 24 of 233 PageID: 48059

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 23
1	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. So the Cahill
2	database was greater than 300. It was just the
3	Rothenberg?
4	MR. PLACITELLA: There's a reason for
5	that.
6	MR. ASSAF: It's reversed. The Cahill
7	database has 300 and Rothenberg says it's 1,800.
8	MR. PLACITELLA: There's a reason for
9	that.
10	MR. ROTH: Let me finish.
11	SPECIAL MASTER: So I just want to
12	understand and make sure we're talking apples to
13	apples, okay?
14	MR. ROTH: We are. And I think, your
15	Honor, there was also some discussion, because nobody
16	was really clear where the 1,800 number came from in
17	terms of the number of Rothenberg files.
18	So it was not clear when we left whether
19	the 1,800 was an accurate number or the 300 or so
20	that's in the Cahill database was an accurate number.
21	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. But can somebody
22	tell me whether the Cahill Gordon database contains
23	information in respect of all of the potential
24	plaintiffs in this case?
25	MR. PLACITELLA: Everybody except the

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 25 of 233 PageID: 48060

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 24
1	Page 24 non-filers. And that's a whole issue about whether
2	they'll actually be in this case.
3	SPECIAL MASTER: Who's a non-filer?
4	MR. PLACITELLA: People who never filed.
5	SPECIAL MASTER: Everybody who never
6	filed a complaint?
7	MR. PLACITELLA: As I understand, it
8	there are close to 16,000 people.
9	SPECIAL MASTER: Who filed lawsuits of
10	some sort?
11	MR. PLACITELLA: Who are in the Cahill
12	database.
13	SPECIAL MASTER: Either filed a lawsuit
14	or submitted a claim of some sort?
15	MR. PLACITELLA: Correct.
16	MR. FARRELL: That's not correct.
17	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Straighten me
18	out, please.
19	MR. FARRELL: There are not 16,000
20	entries in the database. I don't have the exact
21	number, but it's well under that. I think it's 11
22	or 12,000.
23	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
24	MR. FARRELL: And then for those 11 or
25	12,000, the actual amount of information contained
Ī	

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 26 of 233 PageID: 48061

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 25 for each individual person varies. 1 2 So the litany that Mr. Placitella was reading off, you may find examples of each of those 3 4 categories, but I don't believe it would be 5 comprehensive for every individual. 6 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. But I think the 7 point that Mr. Placitella is trying to make, and if I 8 do a terrible job at it, straighten me out, but I 9 think the point that he's trying to make is that you already have sufficient information to make a 10 judgment in those areas that you need it for, and 11 12 that if after you've done that you still need more, 13 there is the ability to seek additional discovery 14 during the pendency of the class certification 15 motion. Did I get --16 MR. PLACITELLA: That's a fair 17 characterization. 18 SPECIAL MASTER: I'm trying to Okay. 19 get to the end point here. 20 MR. PLACITELLA: Yes. But we're not 2.1 just talking about the Cahill database. We're 22 talking about that they scanned every file and they 23 have all of that in word search. I took the corporate rep. That's what 24 25 he said. Every case they had.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 27 of 233 PageID: 48062

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 26
1	So even when they went to Mrs. Holley's
2	dep and took her deposition, they had the entire
3	file.
4	SPECIAL MASTER: I understand that. But
5	I think what I'm being told is that they have
6	everything that they have, but everything that they
7	have may not be everything that there is. That's
8	what I'm being told, right?
9	MR. FARRELL: Yes, your Honor.
10	SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. Farrell, did I get
11	that right?
12	MR. FARRELL: The critical thing we do
13	not have is what was on the plaintiffs' side of the
14	equation in terms of deciding to dismiss or settle
15	cases.
16	All of the information that Mr.
17	Placitella just rattled off are things from the
18	defense side of the equation to the extent we have
19	them.
20	But your Honor is right, this is
21	Groundhog Day. We addressed it at the October
22	hearing.
23	The key inquiry at this point is what
24	was in the plaintiffs' mind? What was in the
25	plaintiffs'
l	

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 28 of 233 PageID: 48063

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

2 the database.  3 SPECIAL MASTER: We can't  4 MR. PLACITELLA: If that's what they say  5 they want, none of it's in the database. It's not in  6 the database. If this is about the database, it's  7 not in the database.  8 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Mr. Boccolini,  9 who I've known for a number of years, is a superb  10 court reporter, but he cannot take down two people at  11 once.  12 So I understand that people feel  13 strongly about this. It is not a milquetoast issue.  14 I understand that.		Page 27
3 SPECIAL MASTER: We can't  4 MR. PLACITELLA: If that's what they say 5 they want, none of it's in the database. It's not in 6 the database. If this is about the database, it's 7 not in the database. 8 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Mr. Boccolini, 9 who I've known for a number of years, is a superb 10 court reporter, but he cannot take down two people at 11 once. 12 So I understand that people feel 13 strongly about this. It is not a milquetoast issue. 14 I understand that. 15 But if for no reason other than my being 16 able to read a non-garbled transcript sometime later 17 on, please work with me on this. 18 Okay. Mr. Placitella, Mr. Roth is	1	MR. PLACITELLA: Well, none of that's in
MR. PLACITELLA: If that's what they say they want, none of it's in the database. It's not in the database. If this is about the database, it's not in the database.  SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Mr. Boccolini, who I've known for a number of years, is a superb court reporter, but he cannot take down two people at once.  So I understand that people feel strongly about this. It is not a milquetoast issue. I understand that.  But if for no reason other than my being able to read a non-garbled transcript sometime later on, please work with me on this.  Okay. Mr. Placitella, Mr. Roth is	2	the database.
they want, none of it's in the database. It's not in the database. If this is about the database, it's not in the database.  SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Mr. Boccolini, who I've known for a number of years, is a superb court reporter, but he cannot take down two people at once.  So I understand that people feel strongly about this. It is not a milquetoast issue. I understand that.  But if for no reason other than my being able to read a non-garbled transcript sometime later on, please work with me on this.  Okay. Mr. Placitella, Mr. Roth is	3	SPECIAL MASTER: We can't
the database. If this is about the database, it's not in the database.  SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Mr. Boccolini, who I've known for a number of years, is a superb court reporter, but he cannot take down two people at once.  So I understand that people feel strongly about this. It is not a milquetoast issue. I understand that.  But if for no reason other than my being able to read a non-garbled transcript sometime later on, please work with me on this.  Okay. Mr. Placitella, Mr. Roth is	4	MR. PLACITELLA: If that's what they say
7 not in the database.  8 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Mr. Boccolini,  9 who I've known for a number of years, is a superb  10 court reporter, but he cannot take down two people at  11 once.  12 So I understand that people feel  13 strongly about this. It is not a milquetoast issue.  14 I understand that.  15 But if for no reason other than my being  16 able to read a non-garbled transcript sometime later  17 on, please work with me on this.  18 Okay. Mr. Placitella, Mr. Roth is	5	they want, none of it's in the database. It's not in
8 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Mr. Boccolini, 9 who I've known for a number of years, is a superb 10 court reporter, but he cannot take down two people at 11 once. 12 So I understand that people feel 13 strongly about this. It is not a milquetoast issue. 14 I understand that. 15 But if for no reason other than my being 16 able to read a non-garbled transcript sometime later 17 on, please work with me on this. 18 Okay. Mr. Placitella, Mr. Roth is	6	the database. If this is about the database, it's
9 who I've known for a number of years, is a superb 10 court reporter, but he cannot take down two people at 11 once. 12 So I understand that people feel 13 strongly about this. It is not a milquetoast issue. 14 I understand that. 15 But if for no reason other than my being 16 able to read a non-garbled transcript sometime later 17 on, please work with me on this. 18 Okay. Mr. Placitella, Mr. Roth is	7	not in the database.
court reporter, but he cannot take down two people at once.  So I understand that people feel strongly about this. It is not a milquetoast issue.  I understand that.  But if for no reason other than my being able to read a non-garbled transcript sometime later on, please work with me on this.  Okay. Mr. Placitella, Mr. Roth is	8	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Mr. Boccolini,
11 once.  12 So I understand that people feel  13 strongly about this. It is not a milquetoast issue.  14 I understand that.  15 But if for no reason other than my being  16 able to read a non-garbled transcript sometime later  17 on, please work with me on this.  18 Okay. Mr. Placitella, Mr. Roth is	9	who I've known for a number of years, is a superb
So I understand that people feel  strongly about this. It is not a milquetoast issue.  I understand that.  But if for no reason other than my being  able to read a non-garbled transcript sometime later  on, please work with me on this.  Okay. Mr. Placitella, Mr. Roth is	10	court reporter, but he cannot take down two people at
13 strongly about this. It is not a milquetoast issue.  14 I understand that.  15 But if for no reason other than my being  16 able to read a non-garbled transcript sometime later  17 on, please work with me on this.  18 Okay. Mr. Placitella, Mr. Roth is	11	once.
14 I understand that.  15 But if for no reason other than my being  16 able to read a non-garbled transcript sometime later  17 on, please work with me on this.  18 Okay. Mr. Placitella, Mr. Roth is	12	So I understand that people feel
But if for no reason other than my being able to read a non-garbled transcript sometime later on, please work with me on this.  Okay. Mr. Placitella, Mr. Roth is	13	strongly about this. It is not a milquetoast issue.
able to read a non-garbled transcript sometime later on, please work with me on this.  Okay. Mr. Placitella, Mr. Roth is	14	I understand that.
17 on, please work with me on this.  18 Okay. Mr. Placitella, Mr. Roth is	15	But if for no reason other than my being
18 Okay. Mr. Placitella, Mr. Roth is	16	able to read a non-garbled transcript sometime later
	17	on, please work with me on this.
19 being very patient, having shaved his beard, waiting	18	Okay. Mr. Placitella, Mr. Roth is
	19	being very patient, having shaved his beard, waiting
20 to speak.	20	to speak.
21 So I think your partner's not happy that	21	So I think your partner's not happy that
22 you're going to speak, but go right ahead.	22	you're going to speak, but go right ahead.
23 MR. ROTH: I just want to make sure that	23	MR. ROTH: I just want to make sure that
24 your Honor has a picture of the universe of	24	your Honor has a picture of the universe of
25 information that we're talking about here.	25	information that we're talking about here.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 29 of 233 PageID: 48064

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 28
1	One, with respect to Mr. Farrell's point
2	about what's on our side of the equation and in the
3	heads of the plaintiffs, we're going to argue about
4	that later. That's not the database issue.
5	Two, those things that Mr. Placitella is
6	describing
7	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, we're going to
8	argue about that in respect of the interrogatories.
9	MR. ROTH: Yes, your Honor.
10	SPECIAL MASTER: But those are your
11	interrogatories. Right now we're talking about the
12	Bevan database
13	MR. ROTH: That's correct, your Honor.
14	SPECIAL MASTER: and its production.
15	MR. ROTH: And that's what I was
16	referring to. The issue that Mr. Farrell raises
17	addresses the responses to interrogatories that we'll
18	address later.
19	SPECIAL MASTER: I didn't understand Mr.
20	Farrell's response to be so limited.
21	MR. FARRELL: It was not.
22	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
23	MR. ROTH: I guess the point being that
24	there is nothing with respect to the plaintiffs'
25	thought processes that is in the database, as counsel

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 30 of 233 PageID: 48065

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 29
1	knows because they have seen all of the fields.
2	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
3	MR. ROTH: And we have spoken Mr.
4	Placitella spoke about the Cahill databases and then
5	just mentioned the corporate rep deposition that was
6	taken.
7	And I mentioned this at our last
8	argument. Mr. Steinmetz was deposed about data
9	Kirkland & Ellis working with BASF collected after
10	they were engaged in this case where they have filed
11	and scanned all of the case files that were pending.
12	So when we talk about databases, that is
13	included in this. That's a word searchable
14	proprietary database that Kirkland has created that
15	provides them with all of the information that Mr.
16	Placitella was describing in his response.
17	And with that, I yield the floor so that
18	Chris doesn't
19	SPECIAL MASTER: Doesn't hit you, yes.
20	MR. PLACITELLA: So the point being if
21	you're going to come forward and ask for this kind of
22	information and ask for people's work product and to
23	invade privilege issues, then you have to make some
24	showing that you don't have it already.
25	They have not made that showing.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 31 of 233 PageID: 48066

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 30
1	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, I think what you
2	really mean is you have to make some showing that
3	it's not otherwise available by less onerous means.
4	MR. PLACITELLA: Exactly. That's
5	exactly right. Thank you.
6	SPECIAL MASTER: That's my
7	English-to-English translation.
8	MR. PLACITELLA: Yes.
9	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
10	MR. PLACITELLA: And then on the
11	specifics, for example, as it relates to let's
12	take the referral orders.
13	Again, I looked pretty hard and we
14	looked pretty hard. I haven't seen any case where a
15	lawyer was compelled to turn over his or her business
16	sources. That goes to the very heart of how law
17	firms survive.
18	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, I understand
19	that. But it is the allegation that there was this
20	organization that referred cases. Calling it an
21	organization might be giving it a dignity it doesn't
22	have. But there was this grouping of lawyers who
23	referred cases out to other people and that the
24	behavior of that group was called into question by
25	one or more courts, and certainly by the American Bar

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 Association, and that having that information would
- 2 assist the defense in saying whether a plaintiff's
- 3 claim is somehow questionable or the like.
- I mean, what do we do in the face of
- 5 that?
- 6 MR. PLACITELLA: Well, Judge, there's no
- 7 evidence whatsoever in the record that Mr. Bevan did
- 8 anything wrong or was part of any --
- 9 SPECIAL MASTER: Nobody's saying that he
- 10 did.
- 11 MR. PLACITELLA: But this is a total
- 12 fishing expedition without any basis whatsoever.
- 13 Just because some lawyers in some other state at some
- 14 other point in time also had tire worker cases and
- 15 did things that, you know --
- 16 SPECIAL MASTER: They shouldn't have.
- 17 MR. PLACITELLA: -- we shouldn't have
- 18 done or they -- doesn't mean Mr. Bevan was involved.
- 19 There's no prima facie showing of that. And it
- 20 certainly doesn't justify it.
- 21 Let's talk about that for a second.
- 22 The defendants in this case reviewed and received
- 23 already all of the underlying medical reports from
- 24 the Bevan cases. They got them in the context of
- 25 those cases.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 33 of 233 PageID: 48068

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

1	Page 32  In the context of the Bevan cases, they
2	had their own experts look at those reports. In the
3	context of the Bevan cases, they never
4	SPECIAL MASTER: But that doesn't answer
5	the question about the referring attorney.
6	MR. PLACITELLA: It does. It does.
7	SPECIAL MASTER: How so?
8	MR. PLACITELLA: Because the bottom of
9	their allegation is that somehow the cases that were
10	referred to Bevan, if in fact they were referred, did
11	not have reasonable medical support and were the
12	product of doctors who weren't doing things properly
13	and as a result
14	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, the way I
15	understand what the defendants are saying is that
16	there was this group of lawyers who were referring
17	cases out. They behaved in an improper way and that
18	may very well have tainted whatever referrals they
19	sent out. So we, the defendants, are entitled to
20	trace the genesis of that action, because if it came
21	from what some courts and certainly the American Bar
22	Association have said was a tainted source, the case
23	itself may not be tainted.
24	But we ought to be able to test that,
25	no?
1	

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 34 of 233 PageID: 48069

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 33
1	MR. PLACITELLA: Why?
2	SPECIAL MASTER: Why not?
3	MR. PLACITELLA: I'll tell you why not.
4	SPECIAL MASTER: Why not?
5	MR. PLACITELLA: Because they
6	SPECIAL MASTER: It's discovery.
7	MR. PLACITELLA: No. Judge, with all
8	due respect, those cases
9	SPECIAL MASTER: It's not discovery?
10	MR. PLACITELLA: There was discovery in
11	the underlying case. Those medicals were given to
12	Engelhard and BASF. They were reviewed by their
13	experts
14	SPECIAL MASTER: Right.
15	MR. PLACITELLA: in those cases.
16	They were not challenged in those cases.
17	In fact, Engelhard and BASF settled
18	cases after they reviewed those medicals for cheap.
19	They did not challenge those medicals. They did not
20	challenge those medical reports in the underlying
21	case or they got people to dismiss their cases.
22	By the Third Circuit, that ship has
23	sailed. They have lost their right to challenge the
24	medical causation in that underlying case.
25	They reviewed those medicals, your

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 34 They had their experts review those 1 Honor. 2 medicals. And they were not challenged. If they 3 had a problem--4 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, work with me on 5 this. Let us assume that the facts are the way you BASF, either in its current 6 just described them. 7 iteration or when it was Engelhard, received the 8 medical reports. They looked at them at face value 9 and made a decision in respect of settlement or 10 non-settlement based upon those reports. And it later turns out that those 11 12 reporters were not credible. 13 And I'm not saying anything that should 14 come as a surprise to anybody here, because my 15 information in respect of that is anecdotal. 16 I remember when within the legal 17 profession it became painfully known that there was 18 something not right going on in respect of the 19 asbestos cases that were being sent through a mill to 20 doctors who really were not doing their job and it 2.1 literally came on the hills -- on the heels, I'm 22 sorry, of a different large case, the fen-phen case, 23 where the same allegations were being made. That's 24 why I remember it from 20 plus years ago. 25 And so whether BASF accepted those

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 35 reports at face value back then, now they have 1 2 knowledge that says: Well, maybe we ought not to 3 have and maybe we should explore that a little bit 4 further. 5 Are you saying that that's not fair game 6 here? 7 MR. PLACITELLA: It's not fair game. 8 They had those cases dismissed fraudulently. This 9 case is about what they did. They made a decision to do what they did independent of whatever those 10 medical reports said. They did what they did 11 12 independent of what those medical reports said. 13 There is no showing in this case that 14 Mr. Bevan did anything wrong. There were --15 SPECIAL MASTER: I don't think there's 16 been any allegation that Mr. Bevan did anything 17 wrong. 18 MR. ASSAF: Correct. 19 **SPECIAL MASTER:** There certainly hasn't 20 been any that I have seen. And certainly nothing 2.1 that occurs here is to be viewed as any kind of 22 aspersion on Mr. Bevan and his firm. Okay. 23 So you can put that -- throw that whole notion in the trash heap, because that's where it 24 25 belongs as far as I'm concerned.

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 37 of 233 PageID: 48072

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 36 1 But the difficulty that I'm having is 2 that you properly so are arguing your clients' 3 position as a fact accomplished. That's exactly what 4 you should be arguing. My problem is I can't accept that 5 6 ultimate conclusion, because all we have right now 7 are a complaint and an answer. So the facts have 8 not been established. 9 I have to say to myself: I understand what the plaintiffs are alleging. 10 And I think you've figured out by now that I do understand what the 11 12 plaintiffs are alleging. 13 But by the same token, the defendants have their defense. And nothing has been proven as 14 of yet. 15 16 And the whole purpose of the exercise in 17 which we find ourselves is to get facts to support 18 either side when the issues are finally teed up and 19 ready for disposition. 20 So that's the perspective that I'm 2.1 looking it from. I'm looking at it from the fact 22 that everybody who is in this room, including the 23 folks who are on the phone, are entitled to get a 24 fair shot at discovering facts that may help their ultimate position when it's being advanced. 25 That's

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 38 of 233 PageID: 48073

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 37 all. 1 2 MR. PLACITELLA: I understand that. 3 let's take it from the proposition. They have the 4 medical report to for Mrs. Holley. It's a Dr. X. 5 They have no evidence that Dr. X did anything wrong. 6 They've had that for decades. 7 What difference does it make where Mrs. 8 Holley's case came from? You know, there's a danger 9 here. 10 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, let me ask you Where that case came from, how is that 11 this. 12 protectable information? 13 MR. PLACITELLA: It's a business 14 interest. It's a trade secret. SPECIAL MASTER: It's not a trade 15 16 I know you argued that. I know it secret. Okav. was advanced. I think I know what a trade secret 17 18 That's not a trade secret. is. Okay. 19 So the fact that John Doe refers a case to me is not a trade secret. The fact that John Doe 20 2.1 referred to case to me is not a trade secret. 22 MR. PLACITELLA: Your Honor, it's 23 business proprietary information. 24 **SPECIAL MASTER:** I understand. it confidential? 25

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 39 of 233 PageID: 48074

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 38
1	MR. PLACITELLA: It's confidential, it
2	has the potential to hurt people.
3	SPECIAL MASTER: How?
4	MR. PLACITELLA: Let's say you're a
5	defense lawyer and you refer a case to Roth and you
6	make that referral
7	SPECIAL MASTER: Not after he shaved his
8	beard.
9	MR. PLACITELLA: Maybe you don't want
10	the world and all your other potential business
11	sources to know that you have a relationship with
12	Roth. I mean, that's up to you know, that's
13	between you and Roth.
14	SPECIAL MASTER: But what I want or
15	don't want is irrelevant to the question of whether
16	the law protects it.
17	Mr. Roth, you're going come to your own
18	defense here. Tell me.
19	MR. ROTH: Well, first of all, whoever's
20	referring a case to me is making a wise decision.
21	But first of all, viewed in the context
22	of discovery of a non-party lawyer, the defendants
23	have argued that the source of the case may
24	demonstrate that a particular case is tainted.
25	SPECIAL MASTER: That's what I

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 40 of 233 PageID: 48075

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 understand them to be saying.
- 2 MR. ROTH: So that's their argument.
- 3 And yet, you know, one, we are not at the issue of
- 4 whether a case is tainted, your Honor. We don't yet
- 5 know what the class is going to look like and whether
- 6 that matters.
- 7 And second, Engelhard/BASF has had these
- 8 medical records not just reviewed at face value, your
- 9 Honor, these were vetted by experts. And that in
- 10 and of itself demonstrates -- you know, they didn't
- 11 make an argument then that these are tainted cases.
- 12 And I think that that's the point, that
- in terms of the -- if the idea is that the referral
- 14 source equals proof that the case is tainted, well,
- 15 the actual proof of whether the case is tainted is
- 16 going to come from the medical records that BASF and
- 17 Engelhard have.
- 18 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, that's not
- 19 necessarily so. As you well know, for example, in
- 20 the fen-phen cases, they settled thousands of those
- 21 cases, until somebody finally said: Wait a minute,
- 22 look at these three or four doctors who are looking
- 23 at thousands of patients and look at their reports.
- 24 All they're doing is changing the name.
- 25 But you can't do that in the first one

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 41 of 233 PageID: 48076

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 or the second one or the third one. You do that
- 2 when you get to the five-thousandth and go: Okay,
- 3 that's now a pattern.
- 4 So I understand your concern. The
- 5 problem is it doesn't arise from the first instance.
- 6 It arises after you see a pattern of behavior that
- 7 allows to you then say: Okay, there may be a problem
- 8 in respect of where this is coming from.
- 9 MR. ROTH: With respect to that, your
- 10 Honor, one, it is fair to argue after the Williams
- 11 Court -- Williams opinion in the Third Circuit and
- 12 Judge Litner's opinion, we're not relitigating these
- 13 cases.
- 14 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, Judge Litner is
- 15 not in my chain. You mean Judge Linares?
- 16 MR. ROTH: Yes. Thank you, your Honor.
- 17 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Okay.
- 18 **MR. ROTH:** But we're not relitigating
- 19 the cases. And the opportunity to have done so --
- 20 **SPECIAL MASTER:** I will tell you as an
- 21 aside, Judge Litner once told me -- he has two small,
- 22 very nice dogs. And he once told me that he would
- 23 write his opinions at home with one of the dogs on
- 24 his lap and that's what helped him write opinions.
- 25 And my response to him was he needed more dogs.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 42 of 233 PageID: 48077

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 41
1	So go ahead. You brought Judge Litner
2	up, okay.
3	MR. ROTH: There's a lot about that that
4	I have to unpack, your Honor.
5	In any event, we're not relitigating
6	these cases. And this really does begin a long line
7	of discovery on what if that we're not at yet and
8	that frankly much of the record
9	SPECIAL MASTER: But we are going to be
10	there shortly, because under my earlier order, the
11	class cert motion was supposed to be filed today.
12	Mr. Placitella requested an additional
13	two weeks. And over Mr. Assaf's very strong
14	objection: I said fine, take the time. I'd rather
15	have it done right than done quickly.
16	So two weeks from today we will all know
17	what the class is supposed to look like, at least
18	according to plaintiffs' counsel, and whether we're
19	going to get a request for full class certification
20	or an issues class only or even under that a limited
21	issues class only. That's in your ballpark. And we
22	will know that when you're ready to tell us, no later
23	than two weeks from today.
24	But be that as it may, that's when we're
25	going to get to it.

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 43 of 233 PageID: 48078

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 42 1 Now, I will tell you I'm fairly 2 comfortable that there is enough firepower in this 3 case and enough room between the filing of the motion 4 and whether we're ultimately going to have to deal 5 with the motion to allow for appropriate discovery to 6 occur and people to get done what needs to be done. 7 And I hope that everyone here is fairly 8 confident that you get something to me, you get a response fairly quickly, including those who sent me 9 e-mails during the football games yesterday, 10 violating a holy day of obligation. 11 12 Be that as it may, we'll get to that 13 You're going to get a quick response. 14 nothing's going to sit. 15 And I said before and I will say it My charter is clear. I got to get this case 16 again. 17 trial ready as quickly as I can. 18 So I will remind everybody here that 19 within two months this case will be seven years old. 20 That in my religion is the age of reason. Okay. 2.1 So at seven years old, it's beginning to grow a 22 little bit of whiskers. And we can't have that. 23 Mr. Placitella, I'm sorry. 24 MR. PLACITELLA: I appreciate that. 25 With respect to the Court, some of those whiskers are

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 43
1	the product of it taking a long time through the
2	appellate process and back. It wasn't
3	SPECIAL MASTER: I didn't blame anybody.
4	I didn't blame anybody. And I will say right now
5	there's enough blame to go around for everybody.
6	But what I will say is that since I was
7	asked to take this over, no moss has grown on any
8	stone here.
9	MR. PLACITELLA: Right. So let me
10	address your issue directly.
11	In fen-phen, which I'm intimately
12	familiar with, you had a bad circumstance, one lawyer
13	out of many great lawyers. And that challenge was
14	made in the underlying case, okay, not in a
15	fraudulent concealment case later.
16	If BASF thought there was a problem
17	SPECIAL MASTER: Actually, I'm not sure
18	that that is correct.
19	MR. PLACITELLA: It is correct.
20	MR. COHEN: It is correct.
21	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, I will tell you
22	that I was in private practice at the time and one of
23	my partners was representing one of the physicians
24	who was separately sued. And the allegation was
25	made in that separate case, not in the underlying
I	

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 45 of 233 PageID: 48080

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 44
1	fen-phen litigation.
2	MR. PLACITELLA: But the I don't
3	want to go there. I was involved in it. I was class
4	counsel. I know what happened, okay, in the fen-phen
5	cases.
6	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
7	MR. PLACITELLA: That was in the
8	underlying case.
9	Here, BASF had the right and probably
10	still has the right if they believe so to go back to
11	court in Ohio and challenge any settlement that they
12	believe that they made under false information. The
13	Rooker-Feldman doctrine
14	SPECIAL MASTER: 25 years after the
15	fact?
16	MR. PLACITELLA: Absolutely. We were
17	told that's the only thing we could do. Okay.
18	Under Rooker-Feldman, if we wanted to upset the
19	judgment of the earlier court, our only remedy was to
20	go back to that state or federal court who had the
21	original case. That's what Rooker-Feldman says.
22	That's what the Third Circuit said.
23	So if they had a problem because they
24	thought they were somehow defrauded in paying
25	whatever measly amount they paid, they had a remedy.
1	

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 That remedy has been available to them since the
- 2 early 90s. And certainly they've known for decades
- 3 of the issue about the National Tire Workers Project
- 4 that they throw into every brief.
- 5 They chose to do nothing. They can't
- 6 now try to use that as a defense in a case that has
- 7 been extinguished. And that's exactly what they're
- 8 trying to do. That's exactly what the Third Circuit
- 9 said none of us can do. We cannot relitigate the
- 10 merits.
- 11 So if they believe that somehow the
- 12 doctors' reports do not support the settlement that
- 13 they -- they can go back to that court and ask that
- 14 court to reopen that case.
- They can't come here and ask to litigate
- 16 that here. That's not what the law says, with all
- 17 due respect. And that's clearly beyond the dictates
- 18 of the Third Circuit.
- 19 Going to the other arguments, the issue
- 20 of settlements, this Court has already ordered that
- 21 BASF is not entitled to the discovery of any other
- 22 settlement information but for the 30 that have been
- 23 provided.
- And now what BASF wants to do is say:
- 25 Okay. Well, that order didn't mean anything. Now we

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 47 of 233 PageID: 48082

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 46 want the settlement information for everybody else, 1 2 whether or not those settlements were confidential. 3 And now the problem here is as follows. 4 Some of them may not have been confidential. 5 don't know. Many of them I know from pattern and 6 practice were confidential. That means that under 7 the Rules of Professional Responsibility, Mr. Bevan 8 has obligations concerning the disclosure of 9 confidential settlement information that frankly has 10 no place here. I understand their argument. But it has no place here. 11 12 The fact that these people were 13 defrauded has -- what they got from Owens Corning Fiberglass in a settlement under seal or under 14 15 confidentiality should not be subject to discovery 16 here. 17 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. What they got. 18 But how about the fact of the settlement? 19 MR. PLACITELLA: The fact --20 SPECIAL MASTER: Not the amount. The 2.1 fact of the settlement. 22 MR. PLACITELLA: It is known -- it is 23 not -- they know who settled. And that's not a 24 confidential -- I mean, the fact that a settlement 25 took place is not confidential.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 48 of 233 PageID: 48083

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 47
1	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. And so
2	MR. PLACITELLA: The fact that the
3	settlement took place is not confidential.
4	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. So let me take
5	that a little bit further along the way. The fact
6	that somebody qualified for or received payment,
7	without disclosing the amount, from an asbestos
8	settlement trust, is that confidential?
9	MR. PLACITELLA: It is not confidential.
10	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. So including
11	that on the database would not make anybody crazy,
12	except for Mr. Roth who has his hand up.
13	MR. ROTH: The only question I have,
14	your Honor, and I don't know what the answer is, but
15	I believe it is not simply a yes/no, there's not a
16	yes/no field, did you qualify or didn't you. It may
17	just have a number.
18	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, I'm sure that's
19	easily remediable.
20	MR. ASSAF: If it's confidential.
21	MR. PLACITELLA: Well, how there are
22	some trusts that say it's confidential. There are
23	others that don't speak to it directly. This is a
24	sideshow, frankly, that is totally unnecessary.
25	SPECIAL MASTER: Well

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 49 of 233 PageID: 48084

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 48
1	MR. PLACITELLA: What does this have to
2	do with the plaintiffs' allegations in this case?
3	Nothing. Nothing.
4	SPECIAL MASTER: I don't agree with you
5	on that. But you have a position to advance. And I
6	appreciate not only the cogency but also the passion
7	with which you present it.
8	You keep making Mr. Assaf write notes to
9	poor Mr. Farrell, who will according to those notes
10	have to speak for two and a half hours, which he's
11	not going to get.
12	MR. FARRELL: It might be three, your
13	Honor.
14	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, okay. If you're
15	not getting two and a half, you're not getting three.
16	Mr. Little, you've been so patient over
17	here and you have everybody picking at the carcass of
18	your client. So anything you want to add?
19	MR. LITTLE: Thank you, your Honor.
20	Yes, I just want to make a point about your summary
21	of the referral source and why it may be important.
22	You mentioned several times the doctors.
23	The doctors, the experts are the evidence. And if
24	there is some part of the underlying case that is to
25	be impugned, it's the experts and not the referral

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 50 of 233 PageID: 48085

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 49
1	source.
2	SPECIAL MASTER: But correct me if I'm
3	wrong, I understood that the doctors sort of came
4	from the referral source, that they were
5	hand-in-hand. Were they not?
6	MR. ASSAF: Correct.
7	MR. LITTLE: In some cases they may have
8	been. In some cases they may not have been. But
9	what using the referral source
10	SPECIAL MASTER: But to use Mr.
11	Placitella's term, isn't the custom and practice that
12	when those cases were sent from the referral source
13	to, for example, your client, Mr. Bevan, it came as a
14	completed package, it would have the plaintiff, it
15	would have the medical records, it would have the
16	experts' reports, so that your client would then only
17	have to file a complaint and move on from there.
18	MR. LITTLE: Not necessarily. That's
19	not my understanding.
20	SPECIAL MASTER: Not necessarily, okay.
21	MR. LITTLE: And even if that were the
22	case, Mr. Bevan could engage his own experts.
23	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, he could have.
24	But did he?
25	MR. PLACITELLA: Yes.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 51 of 233 PageID: 48086

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 50
1	MR. LITTLE: And
2	SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. Placitella?
3	MR. PLACITELLA: As I understood it,
4	every case got an independent expert that was
5	ultimately accepted and audited by numerous asbestos
6	trusts.
7	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. So when you say
8	every case, you mean every Bevan case?
9	MR. PLACITELLA: Every Bevan case.
10	SPECIAL MASTER: Is that true
11	across-the-board?
12	MR. PLACITELLA: I have no idea.
13	SPECIAL MASTER: At least the
14	MR. PLACITELLA: We're talking about
15	Bevan's cases, right.
16	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
17	MR. ASSAF: And, your Honor, so and I
18	certainly believe what Mr. Placitella says.
19	But there also came a time where,
20	because of federal courts both in the Grace trust and
21	in the Raymark case, excluding the doctors that came
22	with the package, okay, and what I've read is it was
23	a package, because that's what the ABA refers to.
24	SPECIAL MASTER: That's what I thought.
25	MR. ASSAF: So there came a time where

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 52 of 233 PageID: 48087

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 51 it would have been malpractice not to try to get 1 2. another doctor because these doctors were being 3 excluded. 4 MR. PLACITELLA: So he has them. He's 5 had cases approved by the trust way after all this by 6 independent experts. These are valid cases. 7 SPECIAL MASTER: We're not being kind to 8 Mr. Little, who's been very patient. 9 MR. LITTLE: Your Honor, the analogy is if in a case a party were to seek information about 10 the attorney's sanction history and try to admit that 11 12 as evidence as to whether the underlying claims are or are not valid, it simply is not something that 13 would ever be admissible in the underlying case. 14 15 If you want to impugn the credibility of the evidence, it is the experts. And that is 16 17 information that not only my understanding is that 18 BASF already has, but that's not reflected in the 19 field that is in dispute. It's reflected in a 20 different field that was part of a proposal that was 2.1 made during the meet and confer process. 22 SPECIAL MASTER: When this database is 23 reduced to a spreadsheet, how many columns does it 24 have? 25 MR. LITTLE: My understanding is that

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 53 of 233 PageID: 48088

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 52
1	it's not 350, but 415.
2	MR. FARRELL: I have a copy here, your
3	Honor, if you'd like to see it.
4	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
5	MR. LITTLE: Yeah, 415 I believe.
6	MR. PLACITELLA: 415.
7	MR. FARRELL: That is the entry just for
8	one of the putative class representatives.
9	SPECIAL MASTER: For William Clark?
10	MR. FARRELL: Correct.
11	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, Nancy Pease, did
12	I pronounce that correctly? P-E-A-S-E.
13	MR. FARRELL: Yes. What I don't think
14	is
15	SPECIAL MASTER: There's a lot of
16	information here that I frankly don't think is all
17	that important. I think it would have been
18	important under the underlying case, but not in this
19	case.
20	Okay. Can I hold onto this for a
21	minute?
22	MR. FARRELL: Yes, your Honor.
23	SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you.
24	I'm sorry, Mr. Little, we keep
25	interrupting you.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 54 of 233 PageID: 48089

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 53
1	MR. LITTLE: That's okay. I finished
2	on that point.
3	The only other thing that I want to
4	differentiate is the difference between what I
5	understand the Cahill database to be and the
6	authority that might govern its production and the
7	Bevan database. You asked about authority
8	previously.
9	And unlike with the Cahill database,
10	and this is only my own understanding from reading
11	the parties' briefing on the issue, is that it
12	reflected information that Cahill received on behalf
13	of BASF from the parties that had filed or submitted
14	claims against it. So that information by its very
15	nature is not privileged.
16	In addition, the work product protection
17	over that database is owned by two parties to this
18	lawsuit and so it's not subject to Rule 45.
19	The difference with the Bevan database
20	is that Rule 45 contains mandatory language that work
21	product and in this case I don't think that
22	there's a dispute that this is information that was
23	compiled and arranged by attorneys in anticipation of
24	litigation.
25	Rule 45 contains mandatory language,

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 54 1 Rule 45(d)(2), that says that the Court must protect 2 that information from disclosure. 3 There is a second category below that, I 4 believe that's paragraph 3 of that same rule, that says that the Court may limit or impose restrictions 5 6 on production of trade secret and proprietary 7 information and several other categories. 8 So there is authority that puts the 9 Bevan database in a different position than the Cahill database, and that is that the information in 10 that database is received in part from the firm's own 11 12 And it is an internal database that contains the information that that law firm felt to 13 be crucial to that case. 14 And it is the privilege, whether it's 15 16 work product or attorney/client, is owned by a non-party that is subject to this additional 17 18 protection under Rule 45. 19 And so I just want to make clear that 20 that's what distinguishes the Cahill database. 2.1 **SPECIAL MASTER:** What part of Rule 45 22 are you relying on? Because I don't see it. And I 23 I don't see it providing the kind just looked at it. 24 of expansive protection that you seem to be reading.

25

And I'm happy to hand it to you.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 56 of 233 PageID: 48091

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 55
1	MR. LITTLE: Sure, that would be
2	SPECIAL MASTER: And I think you want to
3	be looking at the lefthand side page. No, the other
4	lefthand. There you go.
5	MR. LITTLE: I'm referring to $(d)(3)$ .
6	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
7	MR. LITTLE: On a timely motion, the
8	Court must quash or modify a subpoena that requires
9	disclosure of privileged or other protected matter if
10	no exception or waiver applies.
11	And so with regard to the named
12	plaintiffs, I understand that the Court has ruled
13	that there's been some sort of limited waiver.
14	With regard to
15	SPECIAL MASTER: That was
16	MR. LITTLE: the putative class
17	members
18	SPECIAL MASTER: Chief Judge Linares
19	decided that.
20	MR. LITTLE: Right, some amount of
21	waiver. It's unclear to me how extensive that is or
22	what that applies to.
23	But that's not the issue presented in
24	this motion. In this motion we're dealing with
25	non-parties who have not had an opportunity to retain
1	

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 56 their own counsel, to opt out of this litigation, and 1 2 should not be bound by a decision that essentially 3 opens the door on their work product and privileged 4 information. 5 SPECIAL MASTER: Now, tell me a little 6 bit more about your work product argument. Because 7 when I look at these databases, when they are 8 produced in a format that human beings can read, they 9 really very much look like summaries under the Federal Rules of Evidence, where the summary is 10 admissible if the information that is set forth in 11 12 the summary is too voluminous to use. 13 The creation of a summary doesn't make 14 it work product. It just makes it a summary. 15 How is this a work product? 16 MR. LITTLE: Correct. 17 SPECIAL MASTER: I mean, when you as a 18 lawyer decide that you're going to make stuff more 19 easily digestible to you, how is that work product, 20 just because you happen to be a lawyer? 2.1 It's just like not every conversation 22 that you have as a lawyer is attorney/client 23 Not everything that you do is work privileged. 24 product protected. 25 So tell me how this database, and I'm

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 58 of 233 PageID: 48093

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 57 waving what Mr. Farrell let me look at, how this 1 2 database somehow is work product for you. 3 MR. LITTLE: Correct. And there's two 4 bases for that. 5 And the first basis is that the 6 information that is being summarized is itself work 7 product or privileged either because it was received 8 from the client or from a consulting expert as opposed to a testifying expert or somebody working on 9 behalf of the lawyer. And much of that 10 information --11 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, that doesn't make 12 13 it work product. That makes --14 MR. LITTLE: That makes it privileged. 15 **SPECIAL MASTER:** -- it privileged. 16 Correct. 17 MR. LITTLE: And in the other category 18 is the fact that the information that was chosen and 19 selected for this database reflects the attorney's 20 decision about what information is crucial to that 2.1 client's case. 22 And so there is in the Third Circuit a 23 selection and incorporation doctrine that I believe 24 applies to this database. But some of the information contained in 25

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 this also is the same kind of information that would
- 2 be reflected in any case memorandum that an attorney
- 3 would prepare for the file in any of our cases.
- 4 The fact that it's arranged in
- 5 relational databases that can be sort of called upon
- 6 to produce reports containing, you know, specific
- 7 information, doesn't make it any different than any
- 8 other internal document that's prepared for
- 9 litigation.
- 10 SPECIAL MASTER: And correct me if I'm
- 11 wrong, but is what Mr. Farrell handed over to me, is
- 12 that typical of the categories and of the fields in
- 13 this database?
- 14 MR. LITTLE: I believe that reflects all
- 15 of the possible fields.
- 16 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. So if I said to
- 17 Mr. Farrell, Mr. Farrell, identify for me the six
- 18 fields that you really want by way of information,
- 19 and we narrow everything down to the point where some
- 20 if not all of your concerns go away, would that plus
- 21 a 502(d) order satisfy your concerns?
- 22 MR. LITTLE: Well, I don't think that I
- 23 can --
- 24 SPECIAL MASTER: It's hard -- I'm asking
- 25 you a question in the abstract.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 60 of 233 PageID: 48095

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 59
1	MR. LITTLE: walk back from the
2	from the position we're taking on the database. It
3	would obviously be better than
4	SPECIAL MASTER: Than a full-blown
5	MR. LITTLE: producing the whole
6	thing.
7	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
8	MR. LITTLE: But, you know, for the
9	record
10	SPECIAL MASTER: So amputation is better
11	than just capital punishment?
12	MR. LITTLE: We'll take anything we can
13	get.
14	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Mr. Farrell,
15	you only get to use one sheet of comments from Mr.
16	Assaf, okay, so pick the better one.
17	MR. FARRELL: I will do my best, your
18	Honor.
19	And I came in this morning and I was
20	going to say that the theme of the day was going to
21	be the sauce for the goose, sauce for the gander that
22	you identified from our brief, but I think your Honor
23	actually
24	SPECIAL MASTER: I stole your thunder.
25	MR. FARRELL: You actually came up with

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 a better theme than I did, which was the Groundhog
- 2 Day point, because I think much of what we've heard
- 3 over the last hour plus is material that's already
- 4 been argued for months and rejected.
- 5 We heard scope of discovery and
- 6 forfeiture of discovery, which has been rejected
- 7 multiple times by Chief Judge Linares and by your
- 8 Honor.
- 9 We heard Rule 1.6 confidentiality, which
- 10 has been rejected by the Court I think at least twice
- 11 at this point.
- 12 **SPECIAL MASTER:** The last time I said
- it's a court order and therefore under New Jersey
- law, which is what applies, you need to disclose.
- 15 MR. FARRELL: Exactly. And we've heard
- 16 arguments about prematurity and so on and so forth.
- 17 What I think would be helpful is exactly
- 18 where I think the Court was heading, which is how do
- 19 we resolve this?
- 20 And I think much of what we heard this
- 21 morning was really off base from what the dispute
- 22 we're actually talking about is.
- 23 And so I want to just try to make three
- 24 points, because I think it brings us back to what the
- 25 actual dispute is.

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 62 of 233 PageID: 48097

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 61 1 First, the plaintiffs you'll remember 2 vigorously demanded the Cahill databases. When they 3 demanded them, there were no limitations imposed. 4 They didn't say I only want the entries for the six 5 putative class reps, I only want the entries for the 6 30 Bevan people that the Court ordered. 7 everything. 8 That's okay, because SPECIAL MASTER: 9 lawyers are entitled to say do I what I say, not what 10 I do. So, okay, that's -- I understand that. So the plaintiffs set the 11 MR. FARRELL: 12 scope when it comes to the databases. All we're 13 asking is that they live by the scope they 14 established. 15 Point two, most of the information in the database both the plaintiffs and Bevan have 16 17 agreed to produce. 18 The dispute here is really about three 19 categories of information. Most of the argument you 20 heard about work product and this and that, we've 2.1 already passed it because there's already been 22 agreement to produce multiple categories of 23 information out of the database for all of the Bevan 24 And when I say all of the Bevan clients --25 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Okay. So there's been

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 63 of 233 PageID: 48098

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 62
1	agreement to produce certain categories of
2	information.
3	MR. PLACITELLA: No.
4	SPECIAL MASTER: What are they?
5	MR. PLACITELLA: There's no agreement.
6	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, there may not be
7	with you, Mr. Placitella.
8	MR. PLACITELLA: There was no agreement
9	with him either. There was a proposal made that was
10	reached
11	SPECIAL MASTER: Wait. Fine. He says
12	there was. You say there weren't.
13	MR. ASSAF: What does Mr. Roth say?
14	SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. Roth, somebody's
15	putting you on the spot.
16	MR. ROTH: And I'm happy to be on the
17	spot, your Honor.
18	We were what we discussed was
19	those produce the e-mails, that there were areas
20	in this database that would be privileged and that we
21	would not produce. That's what was discussed.
22	MR. ASSAF: And that everything else
23	would be produced.
24	MR. ROTH: Well and that's what I
25	wrote, that we wouldn't have a problem with that,
1	

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 64 of 233 PageID: 48099

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 63
1	your Honor.
2	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. And what are
3	those areas?
4	MR. ROTH: I'm sorry?
5	SPECIAL MASTER: What are those areas
6	that would be produced?
7	MR. ROTH: Well, it's actually the
8	ones that oh. It's easier to go with ones that
9	are not going to be produced.
10	SPECIAL MASTER: No, no. For me it's
11	easier to go with the ones that would be produced,
12	because my order is going to say: You're going to
13	produce X, Y, and Z. So I'm going to need to know
14	what it is that you agree on. Think about it for a
15	moment.
16	Mr. Assaf is going to play with his
17	machine
18	MR. ASSAF: I'm just
19	SPECIAL MASTER: and Mr. Farrell's
20	going to continue his
21	MR. ASSAF: I'm just going to pull up
22	Mr. Roth's e-mail.
23	SPECIAL MASTER: That's all right. If
24	that's helpful, that's fine. But you can do that
25	while Mr. Farrell continues.
1	

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 65 of 233 PageID: 48100

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 64
1	MR. ROTH: Gene, why don't you just
2	forward it to me?
3	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. So you guys can
4	play electronics while Mr. Farrell speaks.
5	MR. FARRELL: There were multiple
6	discussions and agreements. One example that we
7	noted in our brief, because we had to change our
8	brief at the last minute because we reached an
9	agreement, was on whether the plaintiffs had been in
10	silica litigation and were they going to keep that
11	information out or not. Mr. Roth agreed to include
12	it.
13	So the reason our brief focused on three
14	areas, three key areas, but three areas nonetheless,
15	is because there had been agreement on everything
16	else.
17	I'm now hearing for the first time that
18	that agreement supposedly didn't exist. But be that
19	as it may.
20	Now let's talk about the three areas,
21	because I think they illustrate the problem here.
22	I appreciate that neither plaintiffs nor
23	Bevan wants to produce the information. But as your
24	Honor correctly recognized, unless there's a basis
25	for withholding it, which it's their burden to

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 66 of 233 PageID: 48101

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 65 satisfy, they can't withhold it just because it's bad 1 2 for them or they don't feel like producing it. So let's talk about each of the three 3 4 things. The referring attorney. Well, Mr. Little 5 tried to draw a distinction between information 6 received from a client as opposed to received from a 7 third party and argued that, well, information that comes from the clients is special. 8 9 Well, the identity of the referring attorney certainly didn't come from Mr. Bevan's 10 That came from a third party. 11 clients. And I don't 12 see how it could be privileged or confidential. It's 13 certainly not a trade secret, as your Honor mentioned. 14 So if I walk through all of the examples 15 that I've heard this morning about basis for 16 17 withholding, none of them apply to the referring 18 attorney. And that's all the more true given the 19 discovery confidentiality order we have here. 20 To the extent that Mr. Placitella is 2.1 even concerned about reputational harm, the example 22 he gave about a defense lawyer referring Mr. Roth a 23 case, I'm sure they will designate this information 24 confidential or attorneys' eyes only under the discovery confidentiality order. 25

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 67 of 233 PageID: 48102

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 66
1	And I assume that would address all of
2	the concerns they have about reputational issues or
3	whatever may flow from it.
4	The key point is there's no privilege
5	basis or work product basis for withholding referring
6	attorney.
7	Two, settlements, and I think these
8	actually fall into two categories, so let me take
9	them in two stages because I think it matters.
10	One, are the settlements in the claims
11	made on bankruptcy trusts?
12	We met and conferred on this with Mr.
13	Roth and with Mr. Little. They both acknowledged
14	that bankruptcy trusts are not confidential.
15	The reason we cited the Ohio statute
16	that we cited was not to say that it applies here and
17	that this is a personal injury case, but to
18	illustrate the fact that these trusts are not deemed
19	confidential by anybody.
20	And in fact, if the federal bankruptcy
21	court had said they're confidential and they can't be
22	produced, I very much doubt that the Ohio state could
23	then say I now demand that you produce it. It
24	doesn't work that way.
25	These bankruptcy trusts are not
Ī	

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 67 1 confidential submissions. They're communications 2 with third parties, both the submission to the trust and the information received from the trust, so it's 3 4 also not privileged. 5 So you have no confidentiality, you have 6 no privilege, and you have no work product. 7 I don't see any basis for withholding 8 any of the information related to the bankruptcy 9 trusts, including the amounts that have been received from those trusts, because there's no confidentiality 10 in place. 11 12 So then that leaves category three, 13 which is the other settlements, the settlements with 14 non-bankruptcy entities. 15 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, was there any 16 other compensation received by the Bevan plaintiffs? 17 MR. FARRELL: Essentially yes, which I 18 presume that most -- looking at the database 19 entries, I presume that most of them would be 20 entities other than bankruptcy trusts, such as other 2.1 defendants from the litigation. 22 Now, we heard extensive argument from 23 Mr. Placitella this morning that somehow BASF already

I don't see how it can both be true that

24

25

has this information.

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 the information is subject to a confidentiality
- 2 agreement but BASF already has it from 25 years ago.
- 3 One of those two things is not correct. I don't
- 4 know why --
- 5 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Well, the argument that
- 6 Mr. Placitella advances in respect of that is really
- 7 a proportionality argument, if I can put it in our
- 8 new terms as of a year and a half ago. You know,
- 9 whether getting that information is proportional to
- 10 the needs of the case because, says Mr. Placitella,
- 11 you already have that information somewhere along the
- 12 way. And that's how I understood his argument.
- 13 MR. FARRELL: And I don't believe --
- 14 SPECIAL MASTER: And he's shaking his
- 15 head up and down, meaning that I finally got one
- 16 right.
- 17 MR. PLACITELLA: You got many things
- 18 right.
- 19 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Thank you.
- 20 MR. PLACITELLA: Just not everything
- 21 here so far.
- 22 SPECIAL MASTER: Stick with me. We're
- 23 not done yet, Mr. Placitella.
- 24 MR. FARRELL: With the exception of some
- of the talc co-defendants, which your Honor may

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 remember us discussing at the October hearing, where
- 2 BASF may have had some information about what other
- 3 talc companies were paying in those cases, I don't
- 4 think it's correct that we have information about
- 5 what non-talc non-bankruptcy entities would have been
- 6 paying to the plaintiffs in those cases.
- 7 We have asked now for a year for the
- 8 plaintiffs to identify even one confidentiality
- 9 agreement that would restrict the production of the
- 10 information or that couldn't be addressed through the
- 11 discovery confidentiality order we have. And we've
- 12 seen none.
- 13 And in fact, your Honor just heard again
- 14 this morning Mr. Placitella acknowledging that some
- 15 of those settlements at a minimum are not subject to
- 16 confidentiality.
- 17 Given that it is their burden to prove
- 18 up some basis for withholding the information, they
- 19 haven't met the burden and in fact have acknowledged
- 20 that the argument doesn't apply to the chunk of the
- 21 information that we're after.
- The last point I would make is the point
- 23 that I made to your Honor in December when we were
- 24 here discussing the Rothenberg issues.
- 25 And I thought one of the most important

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 pieces of the plaintiffs' opposition on the Bevan
- 2 database actually was on the last page of their brief
- 3 where they told the Court: Hey, none of this should
- 4 preclude us from later relying on this very same
- 5 information. And I thought that was a pretty telling
- 6 statement.
- 7 It seems pretty clear, your Honor, that
- 8 the plaintiffs are planning to use this sort of
- 9 information. And they need to. The reason they need
- 10 to, as we explained in our motion, is that the six
- 11 class representatives have either mesothelioma and
- 12 lung cancer, but 90 plus percent of the putative
- 13 class does not.
- 14 It will be the non-malignant claims that
- 15 were at issue with the National Tire Worker
- 16 Litigation Project that are the subject of all of the
- 17 discussion the Court has seen about fraudulent
- 18 doctors, diagnoses with no actual basis, and most
- 19 importantly I think for the present dispute, the
- 20 amount of compensation that would have been received
- 21 in those cases.
- 22 **SPECIAL MASTER:** But aren't we really
- 23 being told by plaintiffs' counsel: Read between the
- 24 lines, wait until you get our class cert motion,
- 25 that's going to define what the class is that we're

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 72 of 233 PageID: 48107

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 71 seeking and may in fact moot many of the issues that 1 2 are before us. Isn't that really sort of the 3 subtext of what plaintiffs' counsel are saying? 4 MR. FARRELL: Well, we're two weeks away 5 at this point, your Honor. And I would think that 6 Mr. Placitella would be in a position to tell us 7 today are the non-malignant claims out of the class. 8 If they are, then we're happy --9 Well, I'm not going to SPECIAL MASTER: ask him to do that today, because he has until the 10 11 29th. 12 Okay. Well, then we're MR. FARRELL: 13 left in the position of needing to seek the 14 information, because as of today they're supposedly 15 in the class. And as of today, we have only three 16 and a half months of fact discovery to go and we need 17 to get this information. 18 Otherwise, we're going to have no 19 discovery in this case at all on potential damages 20 and the sorts of reliance and causation issues with 2.1 respect to the non-malignant claims that we're 22 talking about. 23 SPECIAL MASTER: I understand your 24 But hopefully you also understand at least

25

from the way that this matter has been handled up

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 until now, that if there is a deferral for two weeks
- 2 to allow all of us to know what plaintiffs' counsel
- 3 will be proposing in the way of a class, that I will
- 4 not allow that to prejudice the defense. You're
- 5 going to get your opportunity to get what you need
- 6 and you're going to get it quickly.
- 7 And it frankly might be easier to do
- 8 then because then we really will know what the
- 9 contours of the ballpark that we're going to be
- 10 playing in are.
- 11 And I hope that you're fairly confident
- 12 on your side that even though you have a limited time
- 13 period within which to do to conduct your discovery,
- 14 discovery will move quickly and delays are not going
- 15 to be acceptable from anybody. And I mean that.
- 16 Anybody.
- 17 I will tell you that at the last time
- 18 that we discussed this issue, we deferred it because
- 19 I was told by counsel that you were going to work it
- 20 out. If I had -- and it didn't work out. That's
- 21 fine. We address it now.
- But I will tell you that if I had
- 23 ordered the discovery and it had not been produced, I
- 24 am perfectly ready, willing, and able to start
- 25 imposing sanctions, because I've said it before, I

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 will say it again. This case needs to move. And
- 2 I'm not going to brook delays based upon folks'
- 3 recalcitrance with complying with orders that are
- 4 issued after a matter has been briefed and argued and
- 5 you've been heard.
- 6 You can disagree with me all you want.
- 7 That's perfectly fine. And if you disagree with me
- 8 enough, there is a methodology for you to get review
- 9 of my decisions. Good luck on that. But there is a
- 10 methodology.
- 11 And that's what we're going to follow.
- 12 Otherwise we're going to move this case along. And
- it's not going to be at anybody's prejudice.
- 14 This case is almost seven years old.
- 15 Everybody in this case is entitled to know what the
- other side's case is going to be about, specifically
- in respect of class certification.
- 18 Plaintiffs have a heavy burden to
- 19 satisfy class cert requirements, particularly in this
- 20 circuit.
- 21 And defendants have every right to poke
- 22 holes into that. That's what makes it a lawsuit.
- 23 The fact that the complaint was filed is
- 24 not an invitation for the other side to lay down.
- 25 You got to expect that the other side is going to

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 fight you back and that everybody has their burden to
- 2 prove. So we're going to keep moving on this as
- 3 best we can.
- 4 Let me make this suggestion. Putting
- 5 aside -- Mr. Assaf is going to have a heart attack
- 6 if I don't let him speak, so --
- 7 MR. ASSAF: Well, I --
- 8 SPECIAL MASTER: So to avoid the heart
- 9 attack --
- 10 MR. ASSAF: Well, I'd like the Roth
- 11 exception to multiple people raising points, because,
- 12 your Honor, if Mr. Placitella is going to sit there
- in silence, it's inconceivable that this class is not
- 14 going to include the Bevan people and the Bevan
- 15 database. This is their case.
- 16 And so to just -- so two weeks of delay
- 17 so that we could come back here and then negotiate
- 18 how it's going to be produced --
- 19 **SPECIAL MASTER:** That's not going to
- 20 happen.
- 21 MR. ASSAF: Because I would like to say,
- 22 your Honor, they know Bevan is their case. Okay.
- 23 We've seen Rothenberg. It's Rothenberg and Bevan.
- 24 And Rothenberg, I don't know what's going to happen
- 25 there. Bevan is their case.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 76 of 233 PageID: 48111

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 75
1	And so they're sitting there knowing,
2	okay, that that's going to be part of their case.
3	And now we're just going to wait until we get this
4	database.
5	And the point I wanted to pick up, Mr.
6	Farrell did a great job as usual, but I did want to
7	say when they agreed Mr. Roth and I have just been
8	exchanging e-mails. When they've agreed to produce
9	the database save three key issues, okay, that's
10	really inconsistent with the notion that the database
11	can't somehow be reformed to produce it without
12	whatever fields.
13	SPECIAL MASTER: If it's computer
14	information, it can be manipulated
15	MR. ASSAF: Correct.
16	SPECIAL MASTER: every which way
17	possible.
18	MR. ASSAF: Correct.
19	SPECIAL MASTER: So
20	MR. ASSAF: And so on the National Tire
21	litigation the National Tire Workers Litigation
22	Project, I'm not trying to oversell that, but I
23	just I get my shot to test the parameters of what
24	these people are and whether they in fact had valid
25	claims.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 77 of 233 PageID: 48112

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 76
1	SPECIAL MASTER: No question. The
2	question that is presently at issue is whether now is
3	the right time for that.
4	MR. ASSAF: And here's why
5	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. That's the only
6	issue as far as I'm concerned.
7	If the case gets certified or in the
8	process of that, you're going to get the right to
9	look at that and take your shot.
10	The question is are you going to get
11	that today or some day after today?
12	MR. ASSAF: So that's what so maybe
13	I'm just misunderstanding again. I think I get that
14	shot before certification. I don't not after
15	Mr. Placitella is suggesting I get it after.
16	SPECIAL MASTER: That's not the
17	question. The question is do you get it before the
18	motion for certification is even filed.
19	MR. ASSAF: Okay. Because it's not
20	going to come as any surprise, in the Widener case,
21	which you're familiar with
22	SPECIAL MASTER: I'm sure that this
23	issue is not going to go away.
24	MR. ASSAF: Correct.
25	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. It's the
1	

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 78 of 233 PageID: 48113

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 77 1 Heimlich case. You called it Widener. 2 MR. ASSAF: Correct. 3 SPECIAL MASTER: It's Widener Law 4 School. Judge Walsh put the brakes on that and the 5 Third Circuit agreed, so... 6 MR. ASSAF: Correct. And again, I 7 don't have to lay it all the out now for your Honor. 8 But if it turned out that a large number of that 9 putative class were part of a scheme to submit false LSAT scores, that would be relevant to the class cert 10 hydrogen peroxide analysis. 11 12 And so all I'm saying is -- and I know 13 we're going to get to this on the interrogatories, we 14 have -- I think it's May 10th or May 15th. And I hear what your Honor's saying about things set in 15 16 stone. 17 I don't understand the burden to start 18 producing this, because I can tell you on February 19 1st when we come back here, there's going to be a long story about how long it takes to get it to us. 20 2.1 **SPECIAL MASTER:** But if that's the case, 22 they may not get my normally sympathetic ear, so --23 look, I'm trying --24 MR. ASSAF: I know. 25 **SPECIAL MASTER:** -- to get the case

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 79 of 233 PageID: 48114

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 78 moving, okay. I'm not carrying water for anybody 1 2 except for Chief Judge Linares, okay, because he's 3 the only one who can get cranky at me, and that 4 matters, okay. 5 You can all get cranky at me, but it 6 really doesn't matter. So that's what I'm trying to 7 do. 8 MR. ASSAF: I understand. 9 **SPECIAL MASTER:** And I think everyone understands that. And so work with me. 10 Help me 11 get you where you need to be. I've said that 12 before. I'm going to say it again. Work with me. 13 Help me get you what you need. And I will try to do 14 that. 15 Anyone else? Mr. Roth? 16 MR. ROTH: Just two things. 17 respond to -- I didn't get an e-mail from you, but I 18 sent you an e-mail from me --

- 19 MR. ASSAF: Correct.
- 20 MR. ROTH: -- where I identified those
- 21 databases that -- or those fields that we said were
- 22 not discoverable.
- 23 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Okay.
- 24 MR. ROTH: And I'm happy to send that to
- 25 your Honor.

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 80 of 233 PageID: 48115

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 79 1 SPECIAL MASTER: No. What I want you to 2 do -- we're going to take a short break. And what I 3 want you, Mr. Roth, either one of you, Mr. Assaf or 4 Mr. Farrell, and Mr. Little, because again, you're picking at his client's carcass, to go through this 5 6 list and tell me specifically which fields you agree 7 to produce, okay, knowing full well that you disagree on the three fields that are at issue here. 8 9 I'm going to tell you right now I'm not going to order the production of 450 fields of 10 That's not going to happen. 11 information. 12 MR. FARRELL: Well, can I speak to just 13 that point, your Honor? Because I think there's a 14 bit of a misconception about the number 450. It doesn't matter what 15 SPECIAL MASTER: 16 the number is. You're going to look through this 17 list and you're going to highlight -- and I'm to give 18 you the list and I'm going to give you a highlighter. 19 Okay. You're going to highlight the fields that you 20 guys agree can be produced. I'm sure you can 2.1 modify -- since this is a relational database, I'm 22 sure you can modify what the net result is when you 23 produce the spreadsheet. 24 And once we define what the categories 25 are, I know that there are three categories you're

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 80 not going to agree on, so I'm going to have to rule 1 2 on them, and we'll work off of that. But first let's try to make sure that we 3 4 define what the scope is of what's being requested 5 here, try to get agreement on that as much as 6 possible, and then I'll address the three areas. 7 And if people want to talk more after 8 that, that's fine. But for now, why don't we try to 9 use that time profitably. 10 MR. PLACITELLA: I just want to correct the record on one thing --11 12 SPECIAL MASTER: Yes. 13 MR. PLACITELLA: -- about the Cahill 14 database. The Cahill database was supposed to have 15 been produced in response to my request for give me 16 the records that you have as to why cases were 17 dismissed. That was why it -- am I wrong? 18 MR. ASSAF: Yes, you are wrong. 19 MR. PLACITELLA: Okay. Well, tell me 20 why it wasn't produced then. 2.1 SPECIAL MASTER: I'm sorry. Before we 22 get into that, I have a feeling that that's what a 23 friend of mine who likes the ballet would call a 24 lateral arabesque. It's not central to the dance. 25 I don't know how that helps us here, Mr.

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 82 of 233 PageID: 48117

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 81 Placitella. So maybe you can tell me that first. 1 2 MR. PLACITELLA: We'll have our break and then we'll come back. 3 4 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Okay. Thank you. 5 Here's the list that you gave me. I'm going to find you a highlighter -- well, that's a blue one. Those 6 7 are horrible. Can we get a yellow one? There 8 should be one down there. 9 MR. ASSAF: And, your Honor, so it's not going to surprise you, the point on the 450, if they 10 sued 120 defendants, each defendant could have three 11 12 categories: Date complaint filed, check received, 13 check sent, check cashed. 14 SPECIAL MASTER: Okav. 15 MR. ASSAF: So that's why it gets up 16 into the hundreds so quickly. 17 **SPECIAL MASTER:** All right. Well, I 18 looked at it. And they seemed pretty -- pretty --19 what's the word I'm searching for? Pretty granular in the information. So that's kind of where we were. 20 2.1 But let's use this time profitably. 22 (Break.) 23 **SPECIAL MASTER:** I just want to confirm 24 that the categories are correct. 25 MR. ROTH: Well, actually, your Honor,

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 83 of 233 PageID: 48118

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 82 there are a couple things that are -- that were 1 2 changed after this. So let me --3 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Okay. So why don't you 4 tell me what the categories are. 5 MR. ROTH: Right. Let me just say --6 and what you have asked us to do and what I had done 7 with Mr. -- I'm sorry, what I had done with Mr. Assaf and with Mr. Farrell after our November conference 8 9 with your Honor was essentially some E-electronic and 10 telephone meet and confers. We objected in front of your Honor to 11 12 producing the database. We said perhaps there was a 13 way to work this out. These are putative class 14 members. And we went down into the woods on certain 15 things. 16 So we said for purposes of reaching an 17 agreement, which we never did, here is what we will 18 I've said it that way, your Honor, not produce. 19 because the version that you now have has factors 20 that are -- or fields that are highlighted with red. 2.1 Those are the fields we believe are not discoverable 22 from the Bevan database. 23 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. But make my 24 life easier. 25 MR. ROTH: Yes, sir.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 84 of 233 PageID: 48119

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 83
1	SPECIAL MASTER: Tell me which fields
2	you've agreed to produce.
3	MR. ROTH: Okay.
4	SPECIAL MASTER: Because those are what
5	are going to appear in the order.
б	MR. ROTH: Okay.
7	SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. Reiley's going to
8	take notes, and what he puts in the way of notes is
9	what's going to be in the order, so slowly and
10	patiently. Please.
11	MR. ROTH: Yes, sir. For the record,
12	what we would have been willing to produce, even
13	though we dispute its discoverability
14	SPECIAL MASTER: I assume that you
15	dispute the discoverability of everything. But at my
16	request, you're kindly agreeing to produce the
17	following.
18	MR. ROTH: Well, subject to your Honor's
19	order, we would produce we were willing to agree
20	to the following: NS, AA
21	SPECIAL MASTER: What is NS?
22	MR. ROTH: I don't remember. And I was
23	told that they're not really filled, the fields
24	aren't really filled.
25	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, let me try this,

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 85 of 233 PageID: 48120

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 84
1	okay, because I'm going to look at this and maybe get
2	some sense out of it.
3	We're going to get the first and last
4	name of the original claimant?
5	MR. ROTH: Yes.
6	SPECIAL MASTER: We're going to get the
7	first and last name of whoever their representative
8	plaintiff is. Right?
9	MR. ROTH: Yes, sir.
10	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. We're going to
11	get the address for the and I say representative
12	plaintiff, not in the sense of class representative,
13	but in the sense of somebody standing in the shoes of
14	a decedent.
15	Okay. So we're going to get the
16	address for that. We're going to get the cause of
17	death. We're going to get alternate contact, the
18	primary employer and the location of the primary
19	employer, the year they started employment, the year
20	their employment ended, their occupation, their
21	primary and/or secondary diagnoses.
22	MR. ASSAF: Film quality.
23	SPECIAL MASTER: I'm sorry?
24	MR. FARRELL: Yes, film quality and ILO
25	are going to be important fields for non-malignant

## Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 86 of 233 PageID: 48121

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 85 1 claims, your Honor. 2 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Film quality and 3 ILO, whatever ILO may be. 4 MR. FARRELL: It's an organization that 5 has standards for reading chest x-rays to determine 6 whether they show markings or indicia of asbestos. 7 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. And what's the 8 state number? What is that? 9 MR. ROTH: That's the docket number. There's a claim number. 10 11 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Okay. And then the 12 date filed for that claim number and whether there was a worker's comp. claim filed and a settlement, 13 14 the primary diagnosis date, secondary diagnosis date, 15 the doctor or secondary doctor. 16 I don't know what product ID means. 17 MR. ROTH: How you prove that they 18 were -- what the product was that they were exposed 19 to. 20 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. And memo, what 2.1 does that mean? 22 MR. ROTH: I don't know, your Honor. 23 Probably related to the product ID. 24 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. 25 MR. FARRELL: It's probably pulmonary

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 87 of 233 PageID: 48122

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 86 1 function test. The next several fields, PFT, 2 physical exam, SVC, SEV, 1, TLC --3 THE REPORTER: Mr. Farrell, excuse me, 4 when you read the letters like that -- if you'd start 5 again, I'd appreciate it. 6 MR. FARRELL: Let me take them slower. 7 THE REPORTER: Just because they're 8 letters, I don't know if they're separated or all 9 together. These again are all going 10 MR. FARRELL: to be relevant to the non-malignant claims, 11 12 presumably. 13 PFT is probably pulmonary function test. Physical exam presumably is just physical exam. 14 FVC 15 is again a lung function reading. FEV 1 to FVC 16 ratio is again a lung function reading, as is TLC and 17 DLCO. 18 So if that information is available, 19 which it should be for anybody who's claiming 20 asbestosis or a similar non-malignant condition, the 2.1 plaintiffs have indicated they will produce it. 22 MR. PLACITELLA: It's not available for 23 everybody. 24 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. 25 MR. PLACITELLA: Nor should it be. I'm

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 88 of 233 PageID: 48123

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 87 just telling you as a matter of medical science, they 1 don't do a reading for PFTs for everybody. 3 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. And then we go 4 to the next page where we have CUY, underscore CTY, underscore date, underscore PD. 5 6 So it's Cuyahoga County, date of what? 7 What's PD stand for? Is that probate? 8 MR. ROTH: I believe these are the 9 probate filings, your Honor, yes. 10 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Okay. Because 11 underneath it's got probate approval, probate amount, 12 probate fee paid, probate fee description, Medicare 13 lien resolved, Medicare lien paid, Medicare lien I 14 assume it's decision. 15 MR. ROTH: Right. SPECIAL MASTER: Medicare lien --16 17 Medicare underscore PLRP, Medicare underscore PLRP 18 underscore PD, Medicare underscore PLRP underscore 19 DESCR, I assume that's description. Group, I don't 20 know what group that is, but it's group. 2.1 POA, is that power of attorney or something else? 22 MR. ROTH: I believe that's power of 23 attorney, your Honor. 24 Medicare SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. 25 underscore SBMT. Probate, that's I assume whether a

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 claim was submitted to Medicare. Probate attorney,
- 2 meds underscore received, secondary underscore
- 3 employer, secondary underscore years underscore EMP
- 4 underscore. I assume that's years employed. Then
- 5 we go through a lot of deletions.
- 6 MR. FARRELL: In the middle of the
- 7 deletions --
- 8 SPECIAL MASTER: Did I miss something?
- 9 MR. FARRELL: -- are the two fields talc
- 10 check number and talc check amount.
- 11 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Okay.
- 12 MR. FARRELL: There's no page numbers,
- 13 unfortunately, but in the mass of a bunch of redacted
- 14 fields.
- 15 MR. REILEY: It's the second to last one
- 16 I think.
- 17 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Okay. I didn't get
- 18 that far I don't think. There they are. Okay.
- 19 We have talc underscore CHK underscore
- 20 no, which is talc check number. And then talc
- 21 underscore CHK underscore amount, which I quess is
- 22 talc check amount.
- 23 And then we get into other information,
- 24 packs underscore per underscore day, which I assume
- 25 is how many packs a day somebody smoked cigarettes.

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 Year underscore began, I assume the year they started
- 2 smoking. Year underscore stopped. Year they
- 3 stopped smoking. VA underscore lien. Is that
- 4 Veterans Administration?
- 5 MR. FARRELL: That is, your Honor.
- 6 SPECIAL MASTER: Then military
- 7 underscore quest, underscore received, which I guess
- 8 an inquiry from the military. That's what quest
- 9 means, question or --
- 10 MR. ROTH: It may be a questionnaire
- 11 that was sent to the client from the firm.
- 12 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Well, whatever
- it is, you've agreed to include it.
- 14 MR. ROTH: Let me be clear about agreed
- 15 to include it, because I don't want -- again, your
- 16 Honor, I think you understand our position, but you
- 17 know --
- 18 **SPECIAL MASTER:** But assuming that I
- 19 order it, you're going to produce this, of course
- 20 subject to a Federal Rule of Evidence 502(d) order.
- 21 MR. ROTH: Yes, your Honor. We don't
- 22 want this transcript floating around that plaintiffs'
- 23 counsel has agreed to give putative class members'
- 24 discovery information to the defendants in this case
- 25 now or ever.

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 91 of 233 PageID: 48126

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 90 1 **SPECIAL MASTER:** You're being very 2 accommodating because I twisted your arm. 3 MR. ROTH: Okay. 4 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Military underscore 5 Branch underscore of underscore service. service. Service underscore start underscore date. 6 7 seem self-evident. Service underscore end 8 underscore date. Basic underscore training 9 Basic underscore training underscore site. Basic underscore training 10 underscore city. underscore state. Basic underscore started. 11 Basic 12 underscore ended. Military underscore base. 13 Location underscore of underscore military underscore 14 base. Base underscore started. Base underscore 15 ended. Location underscore of. Underscore military underscore base, 2. And then the same thing, 16 17 started and ended. Same thing in regard to military 18 base 3. Ship underscore service. Name of ship. 19 Years underscore on underscore ship. And then the same thing for ship number 2. Name underscore of 20 2.1 underscore transport underscore ship. That's for 22 those people in the poor Army who get shipped around 23 Transport underscore ship underscore by the Navy. 24 Search underscore last, last name, search underscore first, first name. Post underscore 1980. 25

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 92 of 233 PageID: 48127

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 I don't know what that means. And apparently
- 2 neither does anyone else. And then filing sheets,
- 3 whatever that may be.
- 4 MR. FARRELL: Post 1980 is presumably
- 5 whether Medicare can assert a lien or not against
- 6 settlements.
- 7 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Okay. And that then
- 8 leaves us with the three categories that were at
- 9 issue here today. And those are the identity of the
- 10 referring attorney, whether any of the Bevan
- 11 plaintiffs qualified for or received payments from an
- 12 asbestos settlement trust, and compensation received
- 13 by the Bevan plaintiffs regardless.
- In respect of those three, nothing has
- 15 been presented that would justify withholding the
- 16 information concerning the referral attorney.
- 17 As I said very early on, I do not
- 18 believe that that is a trade secret. I do not
- 19 believe that it is confidential.
- 20 But in order to protect whatever
- 21 concerns may be, any production made of the database
- 22 will be done pursuant -- for attorneys' eyes only
- 23 pursuant to the confidentiality disclosure order.
- 24 And that should resolve any concerns as to that. So
- 25 that will be produced.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 93 of 233 PageID: 48128

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 92
1	The second category is whether the Bevan
2	plaintiffs qualified for or received payment from an
3	asbestos settlement trust.
4	The fact of having qualified or received
5	payment is not confidential in my view. The amount
6	may be. But the fact is not.
7	So disclosure of the fact of having
8	qualified for or received payment from an asbestos
9	settlement trust will be produced, again, subject to
10	a confidentiality discovery order.
11	And finally, whether the Bevan
12	plaintiffs received any compensation other than from
13	the settlement trust. And again, the fact of that
14	will be produced, not the amount.
15	Now, that said, this entire order will
16	be subject to Federal Rule of Evidence 502(d), which
17	specifically will say, and the order will contain the
18	language, that the privilege or protection that has
19	been asserted is not waived by disclosure connected
20	with the litigation pending before this Court, in
21	which event the disclosure is also not a waiver in
22	any other federal or state proceeding.
23	So no one's waived anything here.
24	MR. PLACITELLA: And is not precedent
25	for any other application, because they've already

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 93 announced that once they get the information here, 1 2 they intend to go to Kansas and California and do the 3 exact same thing. And that's the slippery slope 4 that we're on. 5 SPECIAL MASTER: You need to help me 6 with that, Mr. Placitella, because I don't understand 7 what that --8 MR. PLACITELLA: BASF is taking the position that they're entitled to this information. 9 10 It's our position they're entitled to none of it from putative chase members. And we 11 12 preserve our right to appeal as if it was ordered. 13 They've taken the further position that 14 once they get the information here, they're going to seek similar information as relates to other 15 16 plaintiffs around the country. 17 Well, they can do that SPECIAL MASTER: 18 in other cases, subject to --19 MR. PLACITELLA: No, I'm talking about 20 in this case. 2.1 SPECIAL MASTER: Well --22 MR. PLACITELLA: In this case. They've 23 announced in briefing --24 SPECIAL MASTER: Let us jump up off that 25 bridge if and when we get to it.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 95 of 233 PageID: 48130

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 94
1	But I will tell you that my decision is
2	limited to what is in front of me right now. If
3	something else happens in respect of it later on, I
4	will address it then.
5	But I want everybody to understand that
6	what I tried to do was to come up with a compromise
7	that respected everybody's rights while still moving
8	the case forward. So that's going to be my order.
9	If the plaintiffs think that they need
10	to seek review of that order, that's up to you.
11	MR. PLACITELLA: Thank you, your Honor.
12	MR. FARRELL: Can I raise one minor
13	point, your Honor
14	SPECIAL MASTER: Sure.
15	MR. FARRELL: that I think falls
16	within the compromise you just outlined, but I just
17	wanted to be clear on it.
18	On the very last page of the database
19	entries document you were just reading from, the
20	third to last field is settlements underscore total.
21	And then there's a number provided there.
22	I think that that field could be
23	produced respecting the compromise your Honor laid
24	out since it does not identify the party that the
25	settlement came from or any individual defendant.

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 It's just giving a total amount for the plaintiff as
- 2 opposed to parties who may be on the other side of
- 3 confidentiality agreements.
- 4 SPECIAL MASTER: That may become
- 5 relevant later on. Not right now.
- 6 MR. ASSAF: And following up on that
- 7 comment, your Honor, I don't -- I won't say I know
- 8 where you're going with this, but let me put this on
- 9 the record because I think there's going to be an
- 10 issue from the meet and confer.
- 11 On the individual amounts of the various
- 12 settlements, at the meet and confer just now that you
- ordered, we said okay, but you are to be then
- 14 precluded from having an expert or anybody else now
- 15 rely on those individual amounts since you've
- 16 prevented us from getting them.
- 17 And they -- and I think there's some
- 18 uncertainty. And all I'd like is just some clarity
- 19 that if they're going to use the settlement amounts
- 20 through their experts, I actually get them when they
- 21 start looking at them as opposed to getting an expert
- 22 report that says: Oh, I've been churning this data
- 23 for four months and here's what I found.
- 24 SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. Assaf, you know as
- 25 well as I do that if they rely on an expert, you're

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 entitled to everything that that expert relied on.
- 2 Basic discovery. So if an expert relied upon
- 3 something that has not been disclosed, you're
- 4 entitled to that.
- 5 And you'll make arguments then that not
- 6 only go to the substance but also the process. And
- 7 we'll entertain those when and if they occur.
- 8 MR. ROTH: There's one other point, your
- 9 Honor, to raise about our meet and confer, which was
- 10 to the extent that your Honor was going to order
- 11 production of part of the fields of the database for
- 12 putative class members, that we want it to be clear,
- 13 and I believe we are, I just wanted to report to your
- 14 Honor.
- I don't know how many of the Bevan firm
- 16 clients are run through this database. And I'm not
- 17 suggesting that any of us do.
- 18 I wanted it to be clear because it's
- 19 something that we had talked about producing all of
- 20 the clients. And a lot of that was just because I
- 21 don't know that anybody was thinking about it. I
- 22 don't think anybody was trying to gain unfair
- 23 advantage or any of that kind of thing.
- But given your Honor's order, it relates
- 25 to putative class members, not every asbestos client

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 97 that's ever been in the Bevan firm, only people who 1 may be part of this class. 3 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Well, as currently 4 defined --5 MR. ROTH: Yes your Honor. 6 **SPECIAL MASTER:** -- which is pretty much 7 anybody who was within the neighborhood of some 8 asbestos at any time in the last 40 years. 9 MR. ROTH: Well, that's not true. 10 MR. PLACITELLA: That's not true. 11 MR. ROTH: It's actually related to 12 people who may have had talc claims. 13 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. 14 MR. ROTH: I mean, we pled a pretty 15 broad complaint --16 SPECIAL MASTER: You did. 17 MR. ROTH: -- but it's not that broad, 18 your Honor. 19 **SPECIAL MASTER:** You did. I thought it 20 was -- but, you know, I have the number ingrained in 2.1 my head. It's paragraph 278. 22 MR. PLACITELLA: It will be more focused 23 in two weeks. MR. ROTH: Well, we also agree that it's 24 25 related to talc.

(856) 983-8484

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 99 of 233 PageID: 48134

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 98
1	SPECIAL MASTER: No, I lied. I did not
2	get that right. I thought it was 278. Where's the
3	definition? Oh, here it is. 286. All persons in
4	the United States and its territories who were
5	exposed to BASF's talc and/or talc products sustained
6	asbestos related injury and prior to the commencement
7	of this litigation either (A) filed a lawsuit or
8	other claim for compensation against BASF and by
9	reason of BASF's statements that its talc and talc
10	products did not contain asbestos or that there was
11	no evidence its talc and talc products contained
12	asbestos settled, withdrew, voluntarily dismissed, or
13	suffered an involuntary dismissal of such lawsuit or
14	claim for compensation; or (B) by reason of BASF's
15	statements that its talc and talc products did not
16	contain asbestos or that there was no evidence it
17	contained asbestos did not file a lawsuit or other
18	claim for compensation against BASF. Period.
19	The class shall also include those who
20	have had or had the right to claim damages
21	derivatively based upon such exposed person's
22	asbestos related injury.
23	Okay. That's the class definition that
24	we operate on until Mr. Placitella is going to
25	surprise all of us two weeks from today with a far

## Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 100 of 233 PageID: 48135

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 99
1	more limited class.
2	Right, Mr. Placitella? Don't answer
3	that.
4	Anything else on that application?
5	Good.
6	Let's go to the motion concerning the
7	interrogatories. On December 15, 2017, under ECF
8	285, BASF filed a motion to compel answers to
9	interrogatories I'm sorry, Mr. Little, I didn't
10	see you.
11	MR. LITTLE: Your Honor, if the Bevan
12	firm's presence is no longer required.
13	SPECIAL MASTER: Does that mean you're
14	going to deny us the joy of your presence?
15	MR. LITTLE: With your permission of
16	course.
17	SPECIAL MASTER: Of course.
18	MR. LITTLE: Thank you very much.
19	SPECIAL MASTER: You're going to work
20	with these folks in getting
21	MR. LITTLE: Absolutely.
22	<b>SPECIAL MASTER:</b> the information?
23	Thank you very much. I appreciate you coming down.
24	Have a safe a trip home.
25	MR. LITTLE: Yeah. Thanks for
1	

## Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 101 of 233 PageID: 48136

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 100 accommodating my trial schedule. 1 2 SPECIAL MASTER: That's why I wanted to take you first, because you don't have a dog in the 3 4 fight for the rest of this. MR. LITTLE: Thank you, your Honor. 5 Ι 6 appreciate that. 7 SPECIAL MASTER: We have two sets of 8 interrogatories that are at issue. 9 The first set of interrogatories was propounded on October 23rd, 2015. And the second set 10 of interrogatories was propounded on November 7, 11 12 2017. 13 In respect of the first set of 14 interrogatories, BASF states that the plaintiffs have 15 failed to supplement their answers after subsequent 16 discovery rulings and that the August 3, 2017, 17 decision by Chief Judge Linares re a waiver had the 18 result that answers were to be provided pursuant to 19 the proposed form of order that was submitted. 20 We can do very short work of that. 2.1 Everyone consents to the entry of that proposed form 22 So we're not going to spend a whole lot of order. 23 of time talking about the first set of 24 interrogatories. 25 I think the proposed order MR. FARRELL:

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 101 was overtaken by the amended interrogatories that 1 were provided by the plaintiffs, which in our view 2 were still deficient and were the subject of the 3 4 e-mail that we sent to your Honor. We'll come back 5 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Okay. 6 to that. 7 MR. FARRELL: Okav. 8 **SPECIAL MASTER:** You guys and your 9 e-mails. In respect of the second set of 10 interrogatories, BASF states that they are seeking 11 12 what plaintiffs' alleged damages are, plaintiffs' 13 alleged, quote, original, unquote, documents, and third, facts in support of plaintiffs' class action 14 15 or class certification motion, which has not yet been filed. 16 17 As to damages, which are addressed in

- 18 interrogatory 1 of the second set, BASF seeks the
- 19 amount of damages, the method of calculating damages,
- 20 the basis for calculating damages, and how the
- 21 damages here differed from damages sought in the
- 22 underlying cases.
- In respect of the original documents,
- 24 which is interrogatory number 4 of the second set,
- 25 basically BASF says that we were required to produce

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 originals, they should be required to produce
- 2 originals. And their complaints as to originals
- 3 we're just repeating, which may not have been the
- 4 best thing for you guys to say.
- 5 The third category is class
- 6 certification. And those are interrogatories 2, 3,
- 7 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the second set of interrogatories
- 8 that seeks information about the putative class and
- 9 class certification.
- 10 And BASF says we're fine if that
- information gets produced contemporaneous with the
- 12 filing of the class certification motion.
- Now, you said that at the time when you
- 14 thought that was happening today. But I'm sure that
- 15 you'd be happy to get it two weeks from today also.
- On December the 20th under ECF 390,
- 17 scheduling order number 4 set forth the schedule for
- 18 the filing of oppositions and replies.
- On December 27, 2017, under ECF 396 the
- 20 plaintiffs filed their opposition where they agreed
- 21 to the entry of the proposed consent order, which was
- 22 docketed under ECF 384-12.
- 23 Therefore, the motion in respect of the
- 24 first set of interrogatories was moot.
- The problem is I have since then

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 104 of 233 PageID: 48139

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 103 received an e-mail dated January 5, 2018, from Mr. 1 2 Farrell that basically says we got non-answers. think that was more kindly said than you said it. 3 4 In respect of the second set of interrogatories, the plaintiffs allege that the 5 6 second set of interrogatories are premature and the 7 current responses are sufficient and proper. 8 In respect of interrogatory number 1, 9 again we're talking about the second set of 10 interrogatories, that they are unnecessary and premature, that they deal with damages and we're not 11 12 there yet. 13 And in respect of interrogatories 2, 3, 14 5, 6, 7, and 8, those too are premature. These deal 15 with the Rule 23 certification requirements. According to plaintiffs, these are beyond the mandate 16 17 of hydrogen peroxide, that there will be ample 18 opportunity for discovery once the class 19 certification motion is filed, that the allegations of the inadequacy of the class reps is not supported 20 2.1 by law and has nothing to do with pre-certification 22 motion discovery. 23 The plaintiffs state that the request 24 that they serve verified responses with their class certification motion should be denied, that 25

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 interrogatory number 4 about original documents seeks
- 2 information that's not relevant to claims or
- 3 defenses.
- 4 On January 3, 2018, under ECF 397, BASF
- 5 in reply says the information sought is not
- 6 premature, and again, this is as to the second set of
- 7 interrogatories, that interrogatory number 1 is not
- 8 premature and seeks basic damages information that
- 9 should already have been disclosed, that
- 10 interrogatories 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 seek basic Rule
- 11 23 information, that interrogatory 4, which deals
- 12 with original documents, response to or is prevented
- 13 by further discovery concerning BASF's original
- documents, and in respect of the first set of
- interrogatories it suggests that the order should be
- 16 supplemented.
- Now, to go to Mr. Farrell's January 5,
- 18 2018, e-mail, where BASF comments on plaintiffs'
- 19 supplemental/amended answers to the first set of
- 20 interrogatories. And he lists seven problems with
- 21 them. First, that the general objections remain
- 22 unchanged.
- 23 Second, in respect of interrogatory
- 24 number 1, not a single person is in fact named.
- 25 Third, that in respect of interrogatory

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 106 of 233 PageID: 48141

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 105 1 number 4, the settlement with other entities without 2 details is not helpful. 3 Number 4, interrogatory number 12, there 4 was no change in the response whether there was a 5 decision to settle with Engelhard. 6 In respect to number 5 in respect of 7 interrogatory number 13, the efforts re the 8 prosecution of claims against Engelhard, nothing 9 substantive was changed in the answers. 10 Number 6, that there were no amended responses or answers to interrogatories concerning 11 12 plaintiff Wengerd. 13 And number 7, that the Pease and Ware 14 responses were verified by non-parties without any 15 substitution of parties having occurred. 16 It's your motion. If you want to tell 17 me something I don't already know, please feel free. 18 MR. FARRELL: I think your Honor 19 accurately summarized what our position is, so I 20 won't go back through the whole thing. 2.1 You did initially note that when we said 22 that for the second set of interrogatories we said 23 that January 15th would be acceptable. Here we are 24 on January 15th. I assume we're not getting a second

25

set of interrogatories today. The point --

## Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 107 of 233 PageID: 48142

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 106
1	SPECIAL MASTER: No, because I think the
2	discussion was we'll give it to you when we file our
3	motion for class cert.
4	MR. ASSAF: Correct.
5	SPECIAL MASTER: And since that moved
6	two weeks, I assume that plaintiffs also would move
7	that response date two weeks.
8	MR. FARRELL: Well, that was the point I
9	wanted to make is that plaintiffs' opposition
10	actually said they won't even give us the responses
11	with their class motion, that the responses would
12	come at some undefined point later in time.
13	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, okay, that date's
14	not going to be undefined, so you can get past that.
15	MR. FARRELL: Okay. So the crux of the
16	issue is there's no factual information provided at
17	all and no timeline for provided providing it.
18	Your Honor correctly noted that it falls
19	into three categories. And let me speak to each of
20	the three briefly because I think some of them are
21	easier to knock out than others.
22	First, on plaintiffs' damages, which is
23	interrogatory number 1 in the second set, it's really
24	not a class related interrogatory. It's about the
25	six plaintiffs' individual damages. There's no
1	

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 108 of 233 PageID: 48143

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 107 prematurity issue or any other issue that turns on 1 2. the class motion. In fact, Rule 26(a) calls for the 3 4 disclosure of damages information as one of the very 5 first things that is supposed to occur in discovery 6 in a case. 7 That hasn't occurred here. And we did 8 get initial disclosures, but no damages information 9 was provided. Your Honor raised this issue as well at 10 the October 2017 hearing. And plaintiffs couldn't 11 12 answer the Court's questions about what their theory 13 of damages was. 14 All we're saying is here we are several 15 months into the discovery, regardless of whether a 16 class could be or would be certified in this case, 17 we're entitled to the plaintiffs' theory and basis 18 for their individual damages claim. And that hasn't 19 been provided. 20 So I don't think that one turns on the 2.1 timing of the class motion at all. It should just be 22 ordered to provide the information to the defendants 23 since it's long overdue given what Rule 26(a) says. 24 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Are you done 25 with interrogatory 1?

## Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 109 of 233 PageID: 48144

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 108
1	MR. FARRELL: Yes.
2	SPECIAL MASTER: Who's responding on
3	plaintiffs' behalf?
4	MR. ROTH: Mr. Coren.
5	SPECIAL MASTER: Whoa. I think you just
6	got thrown under the bus there, Mr. Coren.
7	MR. ROTH: No, I'm kidding, your Honor.
8	I just wanted to see
9	SPECIAL MASTER: See if he was still
10	awake.
11	MR. ROTH: See that reaction.
12	Your Honor, we do view it as part of the
13	class issue here. And the reason being that
14	SPECIAL MASTER: Let me ask you this
15	question.
16	MR. ROTH: Yes, sir.
17	SPECIAL MASTER: Are you going to
18	respond to interrogatory number 1 in the second set
19	in a meaningful way on the 29th of this month?
20	MR. ROTH: All of the information
21	regarding the class and how we intend to prove it I
22	believe is
23	SPECIAL MASTER: That's not my question
24	to you. My question to you is
25	MR. ROTH: Do you mean in addition to

## Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 110 of 233 PageID: 48145

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 109
1	SPECIAL MASTER: My question to you is I
2	was given one representative set of interrogatories
3	which were as to plaintiff Kimberlee Williams. And I
4	assume that identical
5	MR. ROTH: Correct.
6	SPECIAL MASTER: were issued as to
7	each one of the named representative plaintiffs.
8	And interrogatory number 1 says, and I
9	quote: Describe all damages, losses, harm, or other
10	relief which you, it's capital Y, which is defined as
11	Miss Williams, contend BASF is responsible, including
12	but not limited to: (A) the amount of damages, loss,
13	harm, or other relief, (B) the method for calculating
14	that damage, loss, harm, or other relief, (C) the
15	basis for calculating that damage, loss, harm, or
16	other relief, and (D) how that damage, loss, harm, or
17	other relief differs if at all from the damages
18	decedent claimed in his original complaint in the
19	underlying action. And decedent is a defined term
20	and underlying action is a defined term.
21	Are you going to produce responses in
22	respect of all six of the named representative
23	plaintiffs that answer interrogatory number 1 on
24	January 29th?
25	MR. ROTH: I don't know, your Honor.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 111 of 233 PageID: 48146

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 110
1	And I don't think so.
2	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
3	MR. ROTH: I mean, unless there's an
4	order obviously.
5	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
6	MR. ROTH: But
7	SPECIAL MASTER: If there's an order
8	will you provide it?
9	MR. ROTH: Let the record reflect I'm
10	smiling, your Honor.
11	And if there's an order, I would. But I
12	would submit to your Honor that it remains premature
13	given what the nature of this class may be and
14	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, but you're going
15	to be able to define that I mean, regardless of
16	how the class is defined, you have six representative
17	plaintiffs who are named. Okay.
18	Interrogatories have been propounded to
19	each one of those representative plaintiffs. And
20	the answer is: Are those representative plaintiffs
21	whose case goes on with or without a class
22	certification motion, whether you're going respond in
23	respect of those six?
24	And don't answer, because you did answer
25	already. You said: If I get ordered to I will.

## Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 112 of 233 PageID: 48147

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 111
1	So I guess the ball is now in my court.
2	MR. ROTH: Well, my hesitation, your
3	Honor, was only one with respect to timing. Will we
4	answer those? Yes, we will.
5	But I am not certain, your Honor, that
6	we will have the trial expert testimony, which would
7	be part of a damage a response to damages
8	interrogatories prepared for these individual
9	plaintiffs.
10	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
11	MR. ROTH: And that's really what my
12	hesitation was. Not if, but when.
13	SPECIAL MASTER: All right. Well,
14	you're going to do the best you can, I'm sure.
15	But I will note for the record that
16	these interrogatories were originally propounded on
17	November the 7th of 2017. So they have been out
18	there for over two months.
19	MR. ROTH: Yes, your Honor.
20	SPECIAL MASTER: All right. That
21	deals with interrogatory number 1 of the second set.
22	Talk to me about, Mr. Farrell, about
23	interrogatory number 4.
24	MR. FARRELL: So this deals with the
25	question of original documents. And on this one we
Ī	

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 113 of 233 PageID: 48148

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 112 tried to explain the background for the issue in the 1 2 brief. But if I could just expand on that 3 4 briefly, our view, the defendant's view or BASF's 5 view is that the original documents issue is frankly 6 a red herring. It's one that the plaintiffs have 7 created. And they created it because they initially 8 alleged in this case that BASF had destroyed all sorts of relevant information, all sorts of documents 9 concerning the talc business. 10 BASF then found hundreds of those 11 12 documents and produced them. And so plaintiffs then 13 shifted their position and said: Well, you found copies but you didn't find originals, where originals 14 they mean I want the actual blue ink version of this 15 16 document from 1975, not the copy that you found. So 17 we have --18 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Okay. You can stop 19 there. 20 Mr. Roth, tell me the basis of your 2.1 argument based on Federal Rule of Evidence 1003. 22 MR. ROTH: For which part, your Honor? 23 We have produced --24 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Demanding -- the whole 25 business about producing documents that are either

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 114 of 233 PageID: 48149

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 113 originals or copies. 1 2 MR. ROTH: That we demanded? 3 SPECIAL MASTER: No. They've demanded 4 it from you. 5 MR. ROTH: Right. We've produced 6 copies, your Honor. They're talking about 7 originals. 8 **SPECIAL MASTER:** They're saying if you 9 have originals --10 MR. ROTH: They're upset that we had sought original documents like micrographs. 11 12 upset that we had reason to question when original documents were produced, for instance, learning about 13 14 a piece of correspondence months after depositions 15 were done. 16 They're upset that we made a defendant 17 or the successor to a defendant search for original 18 evidence and now have sought from the victims of a 19 fraud perpetrated originals, not copies. 20 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Alleged fraud. hasn't been proven yet. 2.1 22 MR. ROTH: I'm sorry, I thought I -- it 23 is an alleged fraud, your Honor. You're correct. 24 And so they're upset that we have sought 25 that information, particularly where some of these

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 115 of 233 PageID: 48150

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 114 original documents are relevant. 1 2 We have -- or may be relevant, your Honor, in the form of actual scientific results from 3 4 studies that are done. 5 The quality is different if it is an 6 original or a copy. And I'll let Mr. Placitella 7 speak to that if you need more information. 8 There is no basis for -- so now they 9 have sought to have these people who are not the original plaintiffs in the underlying cases go look 10 for originals because the copies that we produced are 11 12 apparently not adequate. 13 It is disproportional. It is for the 14 purpose of, you know, getting back at the lawyers who have sought information. 15 16 **SPECIAL MASTER:** So they're just being 17 cranky is what you're saying? 18 MR. ROTH: Okay. 19 MR. FARRELL: It's not function of being 20 cranky and it's not a function of being upset, your 2.1 Honor. The issue --22 SPECIAL MASTER: I know you're never 23 But Mr. Assaf gets cranky every so often. cranky. 24 MR. FARRELL: Well, he's not even cranky about this one. 25

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 116 of 233 PageID: 48151

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 115 1 MR. ASSAF: No, I'm not, because it's 2 just -- believe me. 3 MR. FARRELL: This is again in the 4 category of goose and gander. The plaintiffs' 5 demands of BASF were not limited as just described by 6 Mr. Roth to photomicrographs and so on. 7 The deposition that Mr. Placitella 8 referred to of the BASF corporate representative that lasted for three days, a notice that has been served 9 in this case too on identical grounds calls for 10 things like the original, quote/unquote, deposition 11 12 transcripts from 1983. 13 SPECIAL MASTER: Help me out here, Mr. 14 Farrell. None of that has occurred in this case. 15 MR. FARRELL: It has occurred in this 16 case. 17 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Has it occurred 18 since I've been appointed? 19 MR. FARRELL: No. 20 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Because my 2.1 answer would have been very simple. Those of us who 22 learned evidence from Irving Younger, and there are 23 few of us old enough in this room to say that, know 24 about the best evidence rule, okay, which is codified in the federal rules, Rule 1002, 1003. 25

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 117 of 233 PageID: 48152

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 116
1	And it basically says that unless you
2	are attacking the authenticity of the copy, a copy is
3	just as good as an original.
4	And I haven't heard anybody attack the
5	authenticity of a copy, that it somehow was marked up
6	in a way that changed it from the original or
7	something goofy happened in respect of it.
8	So I would have said: Why are you
9	arguing about originals, unless you're telling me
10	that something awful happened to the original and
11	therefore there's a problem.
12	So if the sauce is good for the goose
13	and the gander, I would say to you what I would have
14	said to them had the application been before me,
15	which is: Come on, guys, it's the year of our Lord
16	2018. We are well past documents being done by
17	scriveners using quill pens. Copies are used all the
18	time.
19	I can tell you at this firm as well as
20	I'm sure all of the firms involved in this lawsuit,
21	you know, nobody keeps paper copies anymore.
22	Everything's electronic. And when you need it, you
23	print it out.
24	So let's not get too crazed about that.
25	MR. FARRELL: I couldn't agree more,

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 your Honor. And I think we said as much in our
- 2 papers. If the original, quote/unquote, documents
- 3 issue is removed from the case and the copies are as
- 4 good as originals, we are more than happy with that.
- 5 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, why don't we wait
- 6 to see what Mr. Placitella and Mr. Roth produce. If
- 7 there's a problem in respect of the authenticity of
- 8 the copies, we'll deal with those.
- 9 MR. ROTH: Your Honor, we've been
- 10 producing documents. We've identified the documents
- 11 we've produced.
- 12 The dispute here is originals. And
- 13 let's be clear. And I don't -- only because Mr.
- 14 Farrell has raised it. We haven't filed a motion on
- 15 this. It is not before your Honor.
- 16 This is not a goose/gander situation.
- 17 Number 1, we've got clients who were told their cases
- 18 were meaningless or nonexistent. It's the Rosenblit
- 19 situation. What they have, they have. We've
- 20 produced it.
- 21 Number 2 -- and again, I don't want to
- 22 get into -- I forget the ballet phrase that you used.
- 23 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Lateral arabesque.
- 24 MR. ROTH: Okay. I don't want to --
- 25 I'm throwing a little bit of a lateral arabesque.

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 119 of 233 PageID: 48154

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 118 But the difference is --1 2 SPECIAL MASTER: You don't look well 3 doing it. 4 MR. ROTH: With or without a beard. 5 The --6 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Did I throw you off? 7 Sorry. 8 MR. ROTH: Again, there's so much to 9 unpack here, your Honor. 10 T know. SPECIAL MASTER: I have myself in tights. 11 MR. ROTH: Ι 12 used to be able to --13 SPECIAL MASTER: Oh, please. 14 way -- that's a hundred thousand dollars right there 15 of psychiatric treatment. So let's not go there. 16 MR. COHEN: It will take weeks to get 17 that image out of my head. 18 MR. ROTH: Some of the discovery 19 depositions, for instance, that had been at issue 20 that were taken in the 80s, we haven't gotten all the 2.1 exhibits. There have been pages missing. That's a 22 fight for another day. 23 But I highlight for your Honor and I 24 appreciate your reminder about the best evidence 25 rule, which should have been number one in my

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 120 of 233 PageID: 48155

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 response.
- 2 SPECIAL MASTER: I wondered why no one
- 3 raised it. And I figured that just those of us who
- 4 had the benefit of Irving Younger as our teacher
- 5 would know that.
- 6 MR. FARRELL: BASF, your Honor, last
- 7 been raising it for approximately five years in
- 8 response to Mr. Placitella's demand for original,
- 9 quote/unquote, documents from 40 years ago that we
- 10 have copies and copies are as good as originals.
- 11 That is what gave rise to our
- 12 interrogatory was the fact that Mr. Placitella was
- 13 not satisfied by the copies and has claimed to have a
- 14 standard for spoliation that rises and falls on
- 15 having the blue inked original documents as opposed
- 16 to copies is what brought us to the goose/gander
- 17 issue of if that's the standard for spoliation, then
- 18 Mr. Placitella needs to live by it as well.
- 19 MR. ROTH: And our clients have not been
- 20 accused of spoliating evidence.
- 21 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, they don't know
- 22 yet. And that's their point. They don't know enough
- 23 to be able to say that.
- 24 MR. ROTH: As we sit here now, your
- 25 Honor, they have not been, nor do they have the same

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 121 of 233 PageID: 48156

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 120 duty that BASF has. And I think --1 2 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, all parties have 3 a duty to preserve evidence that they intend to rely 4 on or that the other side should have been able to 5 rely on. We all agree to that. 6 We also need to all agree that we need 7 to stop this tit-for-tat stuff. Okay. It's 8 unbecoming to everybody. It's just unbecoming. 9 And I understand, believe me, I understand that when you're in the middle of a swamp 10 and you're up to your rear end in alligators, it's 11 12 hard to remember that your purpose was to drain the 13 swamp. 14 But we're trying to drain the swamp 15 here, guys. So let's try to keep our eye on that 16 prize and make sure we get to where we need to go. 17 I think I've made it clear enough what I 18 think is the standard for admissibility of documents. 19 I don't think that Chief Judge Linares has a 20 different view of that. So how about we stick to 2.1 that. 22 If you get a copy -- and I'm telling 23 this to everybody. If you get a copy and you have a 24 legitimate reason to think that there is something

25

wrong with that copy, then absolutely you have the

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 121 right to demand the original. 1 2 But short of that, in this day and age, 3 I will tell you I have tried entire cases where every 4 document that was produced in the courtroom, and there were hundreds of thousands of them, were done 5 6 electronically. There wasn't a piece of paper in the 7 courtroom. 8 And if you could do that at trial, you certainly ought to be able to do that in discovery. 9 10 Yes, Mr. Placitella? MR. PLACITELLA: I agree with what your 11 12 Honor said. Mr. Farrell as an advocate does not 13 14 accurately state my position. And that is not an 15 accurate characterization of my position. 16 And when he files his motion for summary 17 judgment on spoliation, I will articulate my position 18 adequately. And I will tell you that it will be 19 consonant and consistent with what you've articulated 20 here. 2.1 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, that means that 22 you're a very smart guy. Okay. 23 So now that we have resolved -- and 24 we're going to come back to these -- but interrogatories 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the second 25

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 123 of 233 PageID: 48158

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 122 These are class cert interrogatories. 1 What's the problem with those? 3 MR. ROTH: I'm sorry? 4 **SPECIAL MASTER:** What's the problem with 5 responding to those? 6 MR. ROTH: We'll respond to those, your 7 Honor. But it's all going to be information that's 8 going to be in our class cert motion. 9 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. But you're going 10 to file amended answers to interrogatories 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the second set of interrogatories on 11 12 the 29th of this month? 13 MR. ROTH: No, your Honor. There 14 are --15 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Yes, you are. MR. ROTH: Well, what I meant, your 16 17 Honor, was --18 SPECIAL MASTER: I tried to say that 19 politely, but you're not letting me. 20 MR. ROTH: Not withstanding --2.1 SPECIAL MASTER: This is like having a 22 discussion with your wife. You're not going to win, 23 okay. 24 MR. ROTH: Right. And you know what 25 the challenge is, your Honor. It's the same thing I

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 124 of 233 PageID: 48159

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 123
1	have when I have a conversation with my wife. I
2	think it's actually a conversation. Right. I
3	understand that now, your Honor. It's not. But
4	SPECIAL MASTER: It's like when my wife
5	says to me: You don't want dessert, do you?
6	MR. ROTH: Right.
7	<b>SPECIAL MASTER:</b> Okay.
8	MR. PLACITELLA: I'm going to just jump
9	in here and try to save the both of you
10	<b>SPECIAL MASTER:</b> Okay.
11	MR. PLACITELLA: on the wife issue
12	and move on.
13	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Thank you.
14	MR. ROTH: Each and every person who
15	filed an action against BASF based upon their
16	exposure to Amtal talc, at this point, your Honor,
17	that's information that we do not yet have. What we
18	do
19	SPECIAL MASTER: Do the best you can.
20	MR. ROTH: Well, what we know is that's
21	information that Kirkland & Ellis and BASF have.
22	SPECIAL MASTER: But they're entitled to
23	test that information based upon your information.
24	The mere fact that they already have
25	that information does not relieve you as a party to

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 this lawsuit to producing information that's in your
- 2 control.
- 3 MR. ROTH: The information that we
- 4 have -- well, that's fine, your Honor. I submit to
- 5 you -- because I can tell you now without a plaintiff
- 6 who doesn't know and will be relying on counsel's
- 7 advice that we're not going to be able to answer the
- 8 question of who each and every person is who filed a
- 9 lawsuit against BASF.
- 10 **SPECIAL MASTER:** But what I do know is
- 11 that you're going do the best you can.
- 12 MR. FARRELL: As your Honor might have
- 13 guessed, part of the reason we asked the question is
- 14 because we thought the answer would be they don't
- 15 know.
- 16 **SPECIAL MASTER:** They don't know.
- 17 Listen, everything --
- 18 MR. ROTH: And that's right. And that's
- 19 going to be the answer for some of these -- for
- 20 these. And that isn't relevant to the issue of
- 21 whether or not we can get the class we seek certified
- 22 at this point in time.
- 23 **SPECIAL MASTER:** All right.
- 24 MR. ROTH: Is it possible for us to
- 25 learn that? Yes, it is. Do we need to know it to

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 126 of 233 PageID: 48161

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 125 get class certification or for the case to move 1 2 Respectfully, no, we don't. forward? 3 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Okay. Well, I'll make 4 this clear again --5 MR. ROTH: Oh, no, I got it. 6 **SPECIAL MASTER:** -- when I issue the 7 decision. But I'm not asking anybody to make things 8 I'm asking you to do the best you can to give 9 us meaningful responses to the interrogatories. And candidly, I think the rule of thumb 10 everybody should follow is think if I were 11 12 propounding these interrogatories, what kind of 13 response, what caliber of response would I like to 14 see back? Okay. It's a variant of the golden rule. 15 Use that as your standard and you'll be fine with me as far as -- I'm not going to ask you to produce 16 17 what you don't have. I'm not going to ask you to 18 produce something there's no way you can know it. 19 But what I am going to ask you to do is 20 to do the best you can under the circumstances. And 2.1 if you can't, you can't. Tell us that. And we'll 22 deal with it. 23 And if you can produce 50 percent but 24 not 100 percent, tell us that too. 25 But what I want to see is a legitimate,

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 bona fide effort by people to respond to
- 2 interrogatories. I want to see answers that are
- 3 responsive. And I'm going to get to that in one
- 4 moment. But they need to be responsive, because to
- 5 give everybody fair notice, if we have to revisit
- 6 these issues, they will come with sanctions. Okay.
- 7 I don't want to do that.
- I think you've gotten a sense already
- 9 from me that that's not the way I like to operate.
- 10 But at some point or another, and it
- 11 applies to everybody in this lawsuit, at some point
- or another people got to do what they've got to do
- 13 and that which they are obliged to do under the
- 14 rules. And that is provide meaningful answers. And
- in doing so, do the best that you can. And if you
- 16 can't respond to something, say why you can't.
- 17 But using amorphous language, to put in
- 18 a lot of words and say nothing is not helpful. It's
- 19 just not helpful.
- Just like I find people do general
- 21 objections and they throw everything and the kitchen
- 22 sink in. There are courts, federal courts in this
- 23 country that will sanction you if you do that. They
- 24 won't give you a second chance. You're going to get
- 25 sanctioned.

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 128 of 233 PageID: 48163

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 127 1 And in fact, there are some judges I 2 know that if you use any general objections, they 3 will sanction you because they don't think that 4 that's satisfactory based upon a party's obligations to disclosure under the rules. 5 6 Now, I'm not going to be that crazed, at 7 least not in respect of that point. 8 But we need to get answers. They 9 propounded interrogatories properly. It's the 10 obligation of the responding party to respond. And if you want to object, you can object. 11 But unless 12 you have a legitimate objection, you have to respond. 13 And frankly, I'm of the view that even 14 if you have an objection, you state your objection, 15 but then you say without waiving the objection, 16 here's the answer. And do the best that you can. 17 MR. ROTH: Which we have done in some of 18 these responses, your Honor. And I point to 19 interrogatory number 6. 20 But I understand your Honor's comments 2.1 and look forward to hearing your Honor's order. 22 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Now, in respect 23 of the original interrogatories, one of the questions that I had as I was going through all of this was: 24 25 Have the answers been provided?

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 129 of 233 PageID: 48164

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 128 1 And Mr. Farrell's January 5th e-mail 2 answers answered that for me. And I printed out the marked up versions that Mr. Farrell was kind enough 3 4 to provide me. And I printed them out in color 5 because I wanted to see what the differences were in 6 a stark way. 7 And I will tell you that my conclusion 8 was that all of the changes that were made were 9 non-substantive. They were changing from active voice to passive voice or vice versa. 10 It was an exercise in grammar and not an exercise in responding 11 12 to interrogatories. 13 So I will tell you that in respect of 14 the answers to interrogatories that were provided and 15 the amended answers to interrogatories that were 16 provided, they are both deficient in my view. 17 And I'm going to ask you to go back and 18 take a hard look. And the only thing that's being 19 pressed in respect of the first set of 20 interrogatories is interrogatory number 1. 2.1 I want you to go back, take a real hard look at 22 interrogatory number 1 from the first set of 23 interrogatories, which is the damages calculation. Ι 24 think that's correct. 25 It's the second set, your MR. ROTH:

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 130 of 233 PageID: 48165

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 129 1 Honor. 2 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Oh, that's the second 3 set. Let me make sure that I've got --4 MR. FARRELL: In the first set of interrogatories, there were three or four of them. 5 6 It was number 1 on the identity of individuals. 7 SPECIAL MASTER: I'm sorry. We got 8 this -- you put the second set first in your 9 submission. Now why do you have to do that to me? 10 MR. ASSAF: That was a debate actually. 11 MR. FARRELL: Because we --12 SPECIAL MASTER: Whoever said put the 13 second set first lost. Don't tell me who it was. 14 MR. FARRELL: We thought the first set 15 was going to be resolved by agreement is part of the 16 reason. But as to the first set, the ones that 17 18 were the problems were number 1 with regard to 19 identifying individuals. 20 SPECIAL MASTER: I have it in front of 2.1 Just give me the numbers. me. 22 MR. FARRELL: Okay. Number 1, number 4, 23 number 12, and number 13. 24 Number 1, 4, okay. SPECIAL MASTER: 25 Let's deal with number 1. I mean, that's an

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 131 of 233 PageID: 48166

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 130 incredibly -- do you have those, Mr. Roth? 1 2 I do, your Honor. MR. ROTH: 3 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Number 1 is 4 about as typical an interrogatory as they come. 5 I understand Do the best you can. 6 you're dealing with lay people who were not involved 7 in it in the first place. You know, just do the 8 best you can. 9 MR. ROTH: So just generally, your 10 Honor, and I'm happy to go through these with you, but let's be clear what we're dealing with. 11 12 Because of the success of the fraudulent 13 scheme that we allege in the second amended 14 complaint, the people with direct knowledge who were 15 directly involved in decision making are dead in 16 these cases. We've said that in these responses, that I don't have personal information. 17 18 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. 19 MR. ROTH: And so I was listening to 20 your comment about what response I would want if I 2.1 propounded interrogatories. 22 I've told defense counsel what they 23 already presumably know, that the representative 24 plaintiffs were not directly involved in the decision 25 making regarding their case and provided them with

## Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 132 of 233 PageID: 48167

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 131
1	the information and documents upon which counsel
2	would have relied.
3	They don't have direct information. And
4	so it is upon information and belief.
5	And in response to interrogatory number
6	1, it is her counsel, which is Mr. Bevan in this
7	case, and people identified in the Rule 26
8	disclosure, which would have been other lawyers.
9	But I cannot create an answer and
10	provide answers to information that plaintiffs here,
11	who sometimes are not a surviving spouse but are a
12	child or in the case of the substituted the people
13	who we are going to substitute, are even further down
14	the line, do not have that information.
15	And we were clear in our responses that
16	I don't have personal information. I was not
17	involved in the decision making pertaining to my
18	husband's case. That's the response from Miss
19	Chernick.
20	But in an effort to provide defendants
21	with some of the information that we could, that as
22	lawyers have, because they're going to be verified by
23	a client and it's not direct, upon information and
24	belief here are the documents that were relied upon.
25	So I understand that you want us to take

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 a look at these and that your view was that these are
- 2 sub -- not responsive. And I want to push back on
- 3 that a bit, your Honor, and I'm happy to look at
- 4 these.
- 5 But I will tell you that these women,
- 6 because of the passage of time of a family that was
- 7 told you have no claim against us, or if you do, it's
- 8 worth nothing because there is no asbestos in our
- 9 talc, are justifiably saying I don't know, because I
- 10 didn't make those decisions. I don't know who the
- 11 witnesses were. I was a child.
- 12 And they're going to have a chance to
- 13 depose Mr. Bevan or other counsel.
- But we were very clear in those
- 15 responses.
- 16 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Here's the problem,
- 17 okay. And, you know, discovery doesn't exist in a
- 18 vacuum. Discovery exists for purposes of defining
- 19 proofs at trial.
- 20 MR. ROTH: Yes, your Honor.
- 21 **SPECIAL MASTER:** What are you going to
- 22 do at trial, produce a plaintiff that says I don't
- 23 know?
- MR. ROTH: Yes.
- MR. PLACITELLA: Yeah. And they're

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 134 of 233 PageID: 48169

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 133 going to say I don't know because I was defrauded. 1 2 MR. ROTH: And we're going to have their 3 family's lawyer testify and describe what happened. 4 **SPECIAL MASTER:** I was defrauded and no 5 one spoke to me? No one made any reference to me? 6 Nobody made any representations to me? How were you 7 defrauded when nobody made any misrepresentation to 8 you? 9 MR. ROTH: These are the representatives of the decedents' estates that we're talking about 10 11 here. 12 SPECIAL MASTER: Bingo. 13 MR. ROTH: That's right. 14 **SPECIAL MASTER:** And they as 15 representatives don't get it both ways. They don't 16 get to say: I know nothing, but I can make the 17 claim. 18 They as representatives are obliged, as 19 far as I am concerned, to do as much as they can to 20 act in the stead of the decedent. 2.1 And if that means that they have to 22 search a little bit further and they have to make 23 additional inquiries, that's their job. But they 24 don't get to sit there and say: I'm like Sergeant Schultz, I know nothing, and yet still present a 25

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 135 of 233 PageID: 48170

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 134 1 claim. 2 MR. ROTH: And with respect, your Honor, that's not what they said here. And they get to rely 3 4 on their lawyers, which is us who are doing the investigation, and their lawyers who informed their 5 6 family. 7 And in that regard, it's no different 8 than a wrongful death case where the representative 9 can't testify about what a physician or a product manufacturer warned their decedent about, but they 10 have the right to go forward despite their not having 11 12 that same firsthand knowledge. And here --13 SPECIAL MASTER: But they have the 14 obligation to produce something more than just I 15 don't know, because then they don't make out their 16 case. 17 MR. ROTH: And so they went beyond 18 saying I don't have personal knowledge, your Honor. 19 But in these responses we've said upon information and belief, here's what was done to 20 2.1 prosecute the case against Engelhard, and here's what 22 I understand was the basis for that decision. 23 Don't forget, these are interrogatories 24 addressed to individuals who are being -- you know, 25 they're asked to verify those. So they cannot say

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 I've learned this, nor are they as individuals
- 2 expected to do the investigation. That's what
- 3 they've hired lawyers like us for.
- 4 And so in responding to the
- 5 interrogatories, where we've gone beyond just
- 6 claiming a general objection or an attorney/client
- 7 privilege, forget for a moment that -- and we've had
- 8 this discussion, I'm not retreading over it, our
- 9 disagreement about what causation means in this case.
- 10 Right. Did it cause the underlying case or did the
- 11 alleged lie cause them to make decisions?
- We've gone further in the answers to
- interrogatories to say upon information and belief,
- 14 here are the litany of documents, here's the
- 15 correspondence that our counsel relied upon that they
- 16 would have reviewed with our family.
- 17 But they cannot say I know this is what
- 18 happened when they didn't know what happened.
- 19 That's the tension here where we -- because of what
- 20 happened when these cases existed, the original
- 21 plaintiffs do not exist.
- 22 MR. FARRELL: Your Honor, frankly, I
- 23 think that the information and belief formulation
- 24 that Mr. Roth is just describing is even worse than
- 25 just getting a response that says I don't know,

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 because then you enter the scenario that we had in
- 2 the two plaintiffs who were deposed last year, which
- 3 is that they say I don't know, but I know that the
- 4 complaint says X, Y, and Z, and I know something
- 5 really bad happened here supposedly.
- And there's no way for the defendants to
- 7 test those facts because you're dealing with somebody
- 8 who is essentially just spouting hearsay from a
- 9 complaint instead of factual information within their
- 10 possession, custody, or control.
- 11 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, except that by
- 12 testifying that way, they're bound to it at trial.
- 13 They can't come up with something else at trial.
- So when they take the stand, I assume
- 15 that you or some other equally fine lawyer at
- 16 Kirkland is going to say, as soon as the witness is
- 17 tendered, you're going to say: Your Honor, may I
- 18 voir dire the witness on competence? Competence.
- 19 And if they're not competent to testify
- 20 because they either had no perception, had no memory
- 21 of the perception, or had no ability to communicate
- the memory of the perception, they're not competent.
- 23 So I don't know, but I assume because a complaint was
- 24 filed something awful happened.
- 25 **MR. FARRELL:** I completely agree.

## Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 138 of 233 PageID: 48173

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 137
1	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. So that's not a
2	bad answer for you.
3	MR. FARRELL: So then there's a second
4	category of information, however, and I'm glad that
5	Mr. Roth cited Mr. Bevan as an example of somebody
6	who would know.
7	Why is Mr. Bevan's name not in the
8	response?
9	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Well
10	MR. FARRELL: Why is Mr. Bevan is
11	communicating with a lawyer on the other side.
12	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, Mr. Bevan's name
13	is not in the response, because if they put him in
14	there, that's a waiver of the attorney/client
15	privilege.
16	MR. ASSAF: But you've already
17	determined there's a full waiver.
18	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, I didn't
19	determine that.
20	MR. ASSAF: Chief Judge Linares did.
21	SPECIAL MASTER: Chief Judge Linares
22	did. Okay.
23	MR. FARRELL: I think that deals with
24	number 1. The next one
25	SPECIAL MASTER: Number 4.

## Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 139 of 233 PageID: 48174

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 138
1	MR. FARRELL: was number 4. This
2	addressed and again, we're speaking about the six
3	class representatives here. Identify all of your
4	claims and dispositions, meaning all of your
5	settlements, and provide information about them.
6	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
7	MR. FARRELL: No response has been no
8	factual response has been provided to this, even
9	though your Honor has in fact already ordered
10	documents related to this to be produced.
11	SPECIAL MASTER: Except for the amount.
12	MR. FARRELL: That was for putative
13	class members, not for the class representatives.
14	MR. ASSAF: The class reps will get the
15	most.
16	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, do you?
17	MR. ASSAF: I think so. I think
18	we're
19	MR. FARRELL: From the October 26th
20	hearing
21	SPECIAL MASTER: Did I say I said
22	back then that you'd get the amounts for the class
23	reps?
24	MR. FARRELL: Your Honor drew a
25	distinction for the six class representatives and

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 140 of 233 PageID: 48175

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 139 said for them everything goes. 1 2 You did draw a distinction based on the 3 30 Bevan select people. And then for other 4 putative --5 The Rothenberg numbers. SPECIAL MASTER: Correct. 6 MR. FARRELL: But for the six 7 class reps we were to get everything with respect to 8 documents. 9 The interrogatory is essentially the corollary of the document request. We haven't gotten 10 the information. 11 12 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. What's the next 13 one? Number 12. And I should 14 MR. FARRELL: 15 explain. For one of the plaintiffs I think the 16 numbering is slightly different because they had one 17 fewer interrogatory. But I'll explain that number 12 18 is the interrogatory that asks for them to describe 19 the process behind decedent's decision to settle with 20 or dismiss Engelhard, obviously a key issue in the 2.1 case since that's the whole crux of the allegation. 22 There's been no change -- no substantive change to 23 this response. 24 After Chief Judge Linares' ruling that 25 the privilege had been waived and that the scope of

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 140 discovery arguments had been rejected, we presume 1 2 information had been withheld on privilege and other 3 grounds. Nothing more has come. 4 The other thing I would note is we see 5 again the continued references to the second amended 6 complaint and to information in the possession of 7 former counsel. That information is within the 8 9 possession, custody, or control of these six individuals and needs to be provided. 10 There needs to be some explanation that says: I, Kimberlee 11 12 Williams, don't know the answer to this, but Tom 13 Bevan does, and here's the information he has. 14 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. And that was 15 it? 16 MR. FARRELL: And 13 is the last one. 17 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. 18 MR. FARRELL: Again, similar to number

22 Mr. Placitella was just telling us this

12, all efforts made by decedent or her counsel in

the underlying case to develop and prosecute these

- 23 morning about all of this discovery that's supposedly
- 24 happened in these cases. My understanding is a bit
- 25 different. But if that's the case --

19

20

2.1

claims.

## Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 142 of 233 PageID: 48177

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 141
1	SPECIAL MASTER: That's what makes
2	lawsuits.
3	MR. FARRELL: it needs to be
4	described in this answer, again, not by saying the
5	second amended complaint says X, Y, and Z, but saying
6	I may not personally know, but Tom Bevan or somebody
7	else does and here's the information they have.
8	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
9	MR. ASSAF: May I have 30 seconds, your
10	Honor?
11	SPECIAL MASTER: Tick-tock.
12	MR. ASSAF: Okay. Number 11 slash 12 on
13	the reasons to settle, that's where the rubber hits
14	the road.
15	And going back to the old school
16	approach of people like Irving Younger, my big
17	beef
18	SPECIAL MASTER: Are you calling me old
19	school?
20	MR. ASSAF: My concern
21	SPECIAL MASTER: Notice, he's finessing
22	that answer.
23	MR. ASSAF: My concern is that when you
24	put forward an objection that says I object on
25	attorney/client privilege grounds, and then that

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 objection is overruled, presumably when they put it
- 2 forward, they had to have some basis to say I'm
- 3 withholding information on attorney/client privilege.
- 4 Because otherwise --
- 5 SPECIAL MASTER: Not necessarily. It
- 6 could very well be that their view was if this
- 7 information exists, it would be within the four
- 8 corners of what my attorney has and therefore it's
- 9 privileged.
- 10 You know, you've done that, I've done
- 11 that, everybody's done that.
- 12 MR. ASSAF: But on this issue which was
- 13 so central to the debate over the last year, that's
- 14 the thing -- once the Bevan waiver is found by Chief
- 15 Judge Linares, it's hard to think what -- why isn't
- 16 that answer amended, because Bevan clearly knows
- 17 things that he could talk about to the people.
- 18 Again, that's their decision. Or they
- 19 could say I'm not doing it.
- 20 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Okay. That was 32
- 21 seconds.
- 22 MR. ROTH: So I'm looking at two
- 23 pages -- two and a half pages of blue print in
- 24 response to interrogatory 12.
- 25 SPECIAL MASTER: Of whose, whose

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 144 of 233 PageID: 48179

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 143
1	responses?
2	MR. ROTH: I'm getting there.
3	MR. FARRELL: In the Kimberlee Williams
4	example that we submitted to the Court
5	SPECIAL MASTER: Let Mr. Roth speak.
6	MR. FARRELL: It would be number 13.
7	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, whatever Mr. Roth
8	is looking I want to look at.
9	MR. ROTH: So I'm looking at Ware, which
10	is number 12.
11	SPECIAL MASTER: Who are you looking at?
12	MR. ROTH: Ware, the supplemental
13	responses.
14	SPECIAL MASTER: Donna Ware. Okay.
15	That I have. And you want me to look at which?
16	MR. ROTH: I'm looking at response
17	number 12. It begins on page 9.
18	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
19	MR. ROTH: Miss Ware said she was not
20	generally involved she was not involved in the
21	decision making with respect to Ralph's case. That's
22	her husband. My understanding of what happened
23	comes from the second amended complaint. Okay.
24	But we'll deal with all these issues.
25	SPECIAL MASTER: And the privileged

## Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 145 of 233 PageID: 48180

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 144 communications with my attorneys --1 2 MR. ROTH: Correct. 3 **SPECIAL MASTER:** -- which Chief Judge 4 Linares has said have been waived. 5 MR. ROTH: Well, I think that's us. 6 And I don't know that our conversations have been 7 waived, your Honor. 8 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, how do we know 9 How do we know it's with you and not somebody else? 10 Well, I know the guy who 11 MR. ROTH: 12 wrote them, your Honor. But that's fair. 13 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. 14 MR. ROTH: And then it goes on to list 15 the documents and information that her lawyer would 16 have relied upon. 17 So with respect to the notion that these 18 responses were not amended, it's just not true. 19 With respect to the notion that we've not provided information regarding these issues in 20 2.1 the interrogatory answers, that's not so. There's a 22 similar answer for each of these defendants from Miss 23 Williams' interrogatories. For Miss Williams it's 24 number 13. 25 We're talking about two MR. FARRELL:

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 145
what
Roth
lear,
intiff
2.

- 1 different interrogatories, your Honor. That's what
- 2 the disconnect is. The interrogatory that Mr. Roth
- 3 is currently discussing, and so the record is clear,
- 4 we're talking about plaintiff Ware, and for plaintiff
- 5 Ware we're talking about interrogatory number 12.
- 6 That actually corresponds to interrogatory 13 for
- 7 Miss Williams. And I apologize for the confusion,
- 8 but they're the same. It is the interrogatory --
- 9 SPECIAL MASTER: That's all right.
- 10 **MR. FARRELL:** It is the interrogatory
- 11 for Miss Ware, number 12, which asks them to explain
- 12 all efforts made to develop and prosecute claims.
- When I said no substantive change had
- 14 been made, I was talking about the previous
- 15 interrogatory regarding the process of settling the
- 16 claim.
- 17 Now, the point that Mr. Roth just raised
- 18 is actually a separate issue and an additional
- 19 deficiency, which is that interrogatory number 12 for
- 20 plaintiff Ware asks the plaintiff to describe all
- 21 efforts made to develop and prosecute claims.
- 22 And instead of getting an explanation of
- 23 the steps they took to develop and prosecute claims
- 24 against Engelhard, we got a two page long list of
- 25 correspondence received from Engelhard's counsel,

## Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 147 of 233 PageID: 48182

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 146 which is not responsive to the interrogatory. 1 2 MR. ROTH: Well, again, if you look at 3 page 10, while I have no firsthand knowledge, upon 4 information and belief records --5 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Page 10 of whose? 6 MR. ROTH: I'm sorry, of the Ware 7 interrogatory. 8 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Of the Ware -okay. 9 Because I got a pile of them here. 10 MR. ROTH: Yes, your Honor. 11 SPECIAL MASTER: You got to work with 12 All right. And of course -- page 10, I'm me. 13 looking at it. MR. ROTH: 14 Right. The first full 15 paragraph which is in blue, which means it was amended after the -- describes: While I have no 16 17 firsthand knowledge, upon information and belief, 18 records and information obtained by my attorneys 19 indicate that when prosecuting Ralph's case, the 20 Bevan law firm was able to document sales of Amtal 2.1 talc to the Goodyear aerospace facility where Ralph 22 worked, and that the lawyers were also aware from 23 testimony of witnesses in the facility that 24 whitish/gray talc was used by employees in Goodyear's 25 plant. However, upon receiving Engelhard/Cahill's

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 representations and information that the talc did not
- 2 contain asbestos, this was not specifically explored
- 3 in every case. It is also my understanding that
- 4 Ralph's lawyers retained experts in support -- to
- 5 support his lawsuit.
- And that's a response to what was done
- 7 to prosecute the claim, your Honor.
- 8 And if with respect to the written
- 9 communications about why the case was settled that
- 10 piece should be in interrogatory -- or one of these
- is in the wrong response, I'm sorry if one of these
- is responsive to the wrong interrogatory number,
- 13 shame on me.
- 14 But the information has been -- you
- 15 know, the prosecution is acknowledged.
- 16 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, in respect of
- 17 Miss Ware, it should be 11 and 12 instead of 12 and
- 18 13.
- 19 MR. ROTH: Right.
- 20 MR. FARRELL: Correct, your Honor.
- 21 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Finally figured that
- 22 out.
- 23 MR. FARRELL: There's just a bit of
- 24 apples and oranges going on, your Honor. The
- 25 paragraph Mr. Roth just talked about suffers from the

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 149 of 233 PageID: 48184

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

- problem related to upon information and belief and 1 2 information in my attorney's knowledge. 3 SPECIAL MASTER: I understand your But we have to be a little practical about 4 concern. 5 Okay. And that is I don't know how they can this. 6 unscramble this omelette at this point. 7 You have decisions that were made by 8 someone who has been dead for some time now. We 9 don't know what they said or didn't say to the person who's now their personal representative. The person 10 who's now their personal representative is filing 11 12 verified responses saying: I didn't know about this 13 stuff, but I've read A, B, and C, and if you really 14 want answers, you got to go to my decedent's lawyer 15 at the time who might be able to provide this 16 information for you. 17 And since it's already been determined 18 that whatever attorney/client privilege may have 19 existed between the decedent and his lawyer is now 20 waived based upon the allegations made in the 2.1 complaint, that information should be produced to 22 you.
- 23 I read these, the answers in respect of 24 interrogatory 12 and to a certain degree 13 as to 25 everybody except Miss Ware, who's 11 and 12, as in

## Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 150 of 233 PageID: 48185

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 149 many respects a good faith effort to respond to the 1 2 interrogatory. 3 Is it as complete as I would like it to 4 be? Not necessarily so. But it is a good faith 5 effort and it gives you something to start with. 6 So I understand what you want. And I 7 understand why you want it. But the problem is I 8 don't know that they can give you what they don't 9 have. 10 MR. FARRELL: I appreciate what your 11 Honor is saying. 12 What we're trying to avoid is the swords 13 and shields issue. And you've heard Mr. Roth already allude to Mr. Bevan and the fact that he will be a 14 15 witness for the plaintiffs in this case and in fact 16 is on plaintiffs' initial disclosures as a witness in 17 this case. 18 SPECIAL MASTER: Then subpoena him for 19 deposition. 20 MR. FARRELL: But we are also entitled, 2.1 your Honor, to serve an interrogatory on the 22 plaintiff and ask for information in their 23 possession, custody, or control so that we have the

24

25

written answer and the information before the

deposition that your Honor is alluding to.

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 that's the issue.
- 2 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, let me make
- 3 painfully clear that if Mr. Bevan has information,
- 4 that is information that is in the possession,
- 5 custody, or control of the plaintiffs.
- 6 MR. ROTH: Well, we have provided not
- 7 only the files of the six and the files of the 30
- 8 that your Honor directed us to, we also in the course
- 9 of doing that found -- and I don't know that he
- 10 called it any -- you know, there was a discussion
- 11 about the Rothenberg files and whether there's some
- 12 kind of central file about Amtal.
- 13 But Mr. Bevan did find a file that was
- 14 unrelated to any particular client, and we produced
- 15 that as well, of just general, you know,
- 16 correspondence, your Honor.
- 17 We have in fact made a -- I was mindful
- 18 of what your Honor said before about what kind of
- 19 response would I want.
- I can't put words in my clients' mouths.
- 21 I know there's information. And we made an
- 22 investigation to provide a more fulsome response than
- 23 just I don't know, trying to be mindful of your
- 24 Honor's directives from other hearings that we've had
- 25 and our obligation under the rules and at the same

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 time knowing that we're not dealing with the people
- 2 who have firsthand information.
- 3 MR. FARRELL: If this response contains
- 4 what Mr. Bevan knows, so be it. That's all we
- 5 wanted, to be clear.
- 6 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Okay.
- 7 MR. PLACITELLA: Well, take Mr. Bevan's
- 8 deposition.
- 9 MR. ASSAF: No.
- 10 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, no, no. They're
- 11 entitled to know that it is from Mr. Bevan, which it
- 12 doesn't say. Right? Did I misread it? It does not
- 13 say this is the information from Mr. Bevan.
- 14 MR. ROTH: Well, it does talk about
- information that my counsel relied upon and what my
- 16 counsel did. And if you're --
- 17 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Which really --
- 18 MR. ROTH: Well, that's Mr. Bevan.
- 19 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Right. But I'm not
- 20 sure that that person can say, you know, whoever it
- 21 is, Ware or whatever, can say this is what my counsel
- 22 relied on.
- 23 MR. ROTH: Which is why the responses
- 24 say upon information and belief, your Honor, because
- 25 the plaintiff to whom the interrogatories are

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 directed cannot say what Mr. Bevan said or relied
- 2 upon. And if you are saying that that's what has
- 3 to -- what the responses are, okay.
- 4 MR. ASSAF: But there's a difference
- 5 between information and belief and what I am being
- 6 told by my -- that's my -- my quarrel is I don't
- 7 want to show up at a Bevan deposition and just have
- 8 this vague language about information and belief.
- 9 I was much more aligned with the
- 10 question before that said I want to make sure that
- 11 this is -- they're saying I relied or I heard this
- 12 from Mr. Bevan who told me X, Y, and Z. That's what
- 13 I need for the deposition.
- 14 And I heard Mr. Roth just say in
- 15 response to your Honor's question that these answers
- 16 incorporate what Mr. Bevan knows.
- 17 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Why don't we do this.
- 18 Let's make it clear who the source of the information
- 19 is, because if BASF takes Mr. Bevan's deposition,
- 20 they ought to be able to tie him back to specific
- 21 representations made by the plaintiff as to what Mr.
- 22 Bevan said or didn't say, because if your client
- 23 says: Well, Mr. Bevan told me A, B, C, and D, and
- 24 Mr. Bevan under oath says: I said no such thing,
- 25 you're going to have a problem.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 154 of 233 PageID: 48189

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

1	Page 153  MR. ROTH: Understood, your Honor. The
2	person to whom Mr. Bevan would have given advice in
3	these cases is dead.
4	SPECIAL MASTER: Is the decedent.
5	MR. ROTH: Right. So I got a little
6	problem with getting an answer that says: Here's
7	what Mr. Bevan told me.
8	Now, I'm not being glib, but
9	SPECIAL MASTER: But you're going to do
10	the best you can.
11	MR. ROTH: I will do the best I can,
12	your Honor. But here's the thing. We've gone back
13	to provide information about how the decision was
14	made. The clients don't know.
15	I get you want something that says Mr.
16	Bevan did bah, bah, bah, bah, bah.
17	Clients verifying such a response are
18	not going to have firsthand knowledge of that. Just
19	so we're clear, that's going to come from a lawyer.
20	SPECIAL MASTER: Then just put that in
21	the verification.
22	MR. ROTH: Okay.
23	SPECIAL MASTER: That's the way I cure
24	that problem, you know, everything in here is to the
25	best of my personal knowledge, and to the extent it

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 155 of 233 PageID: 48190

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 154 is not within my personal knowledge, it's within 1 information and belief. 3 MR. ROTH: Okay. 4 SPECIAL MASTER: Put that in every --5 pretty much every verification just in case. 6 MR. ROTH: Which is what we've put in 7 the interrogatory answers, your Honor. But I 8 understand. 9 SPECIAL MASTER: I think the answer's -it's got to be in the verification, because that's 10 what -- that's where your client is putting their 11 12 stake in the ground in respect of this. 13 MR. ROTH: Well, when they say it in the 14 interrogatory responses, they have also said to 15 whoever is reading it, right, upon information and 16 belief, here's what happened, because I don't -- and 17 they have said in those responses: I'm not the guy 18 with firsthand knowledge. 19 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Well, but if they say it on information and belief, they have to have to 20 2.1 identify the source of that information and belief. 22 MR. ASSAF: Correct. 23 SPECIAL MASTER: And that's where I 24 think the disconnects lies. 25 MR. ROTH: Okay.

## Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 156 of 233 PageID: 48191

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 155 1 SPECIAL MASTER: Now, you can do that in 2 the interrogatory answer or you can do that in your verification. 3 4 But to the extent that I don't know it, 5 it's based on information and belief from information 6 provided to me by A, B, C, you can do it either way. 7 I don't care. Whatever's more comfortable to you. 8 But it goes to the basic underlying 9 obligation to respond to interrogatories. 10 Now, I will tell you that if I've learned something in 40 years of practicing law is 11 12 that interrogatories are generally a huge waste of 13 time, because what you get are the lawyer's answers and not the client's answers. 14 15 I'm a big believer in requests for 16 production of documents and in requests for 17 admissions. Interrogatories don't do it for me. 18 But it is a method of discovery you're 19 entitled to use. But they always give rise to these 20 kinds of discussions. 2.1 But be that as it may, I think you know 22 where I'm going with this. And I think everybody 23 knows that what I want folks to do in the overarching 24 purpose is let's try to get the information, as much information transmitted from one side to the other as 25

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 we possibly can with a minimum amount of fuss so that
- 2 we can address the important stuff.
- I'm looking at my watch. It's 2:15.
- 4 We've been at this since 10:30 this morning. We
- 5 took a break because you guys needed to go through a
- 6 list that took more than the five minutes that I had
- 7 very optimistically allowed.
- 8 MR. ROTH: Well, part of that was a
- 9 technical problem, your Honor.
- 10 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Now you're blaming Mr.
- 11 Reiley, who is sitting here very quiet.
- 12 MR. ROTH: I wasn't going to name him.
- 13 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, but be that as it
- 14 may, you know, we need to -- you know, I hate
- 15 wasting you guys' time.
- 16 MR. ASSAF: And I generally agree with
- 17 you on interrogatories, your Honor.
- Just to be clear though, Mr. Bevan's an
- 19 attorney, a very skilled and capable one. I don't
- 20 want to show up for his deposition and learn for the
- 21 first time what he was telling his clients as to the
- 22 reasons to settle. And I think I'm entitled to that
- 23 beforehand.
- MR. ROTH: Well, I don't know that Mr.
- 25 Assaf having read the first set of responses is going

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 158 of 233 PageID: 48193

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 157 to be particularly surprised by what Mr. Bevan says. 1 2 Our effort was to provide responsive information so that he could take his deposition. 3 4 What I don't want, your Honor, and it 5 seems to happen every time, is we come back and do 6 make a good faith effort given the fact that these 7 are people who were not the original plaintiffs, and 8 I will be told again I've moved the ball down the line or I've changed the rules or I've done some 9 10 other thing in response to the next set of discovery. SPECIAL MASTER: Well, you just need to 11 12 stop being such a bad guy. 13 MR. ROTH: I never should have shaved 14 the beard, your Honor. 15 SPECIAL MASTER: The beard should have 16 What can I tell you? staved. 17 Actually, on a serious note, I'm going 18 to ask everybody again, attacks on opposing counsel 19 don't work for me. They don't. They actually hurt 20 you when you make them. So let's try to -- I know they're in your drafts because they're in my drafts 2.1 22 of everything that I write. But they're not in the 23 final product. Okay. Get it out of your system. 24 Exercise the demon and go on. 25 Every lawyer in this case is a very good

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 lawyer who's trying the very best they can for their
- 2 clients. I assume that for everyone. And pointing
- 3 fingers at somebody's not going to change my view of
- 4 that. It's just not.
- 5 So when you have a problem that is a
- 6 lawyer problem, just tell me and I will address it.
- 7 We had one, which was the slew of the objections at a
- 8 deposition. I addressed it. I addressed it
- 9 hopefully without pointing fingers at anybody and
- 10 said it's just not going to happen again.
- 11 And I hope in my heart of hearts that it
- 12 never happens again.
- But we need to focus on what this case
- 14 is about. There's more than enough here to occupy
- 15 everybody who's in this room. So let's try to stay
- 16 on that.
- 17 And on that note, in respect of BASF's
- 18 motion to compel answers to interrogatories, I'm
- 19 going to ask plaintiffs to please go back and look at
- 20 their responses, of the first set of interrogatories
- 21 to interrogatories 1, 4, 12, and 13, with the
- 22 exception of Miss Ware's, where it would be 1, 4, 11,
- 23 and 12, check your responses. Please re-respond to
- 24 them as best you can.
- In respect of the responses due from

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 plaintiff Wengerd, the instructions in respect of not
- 2 talking to her about substance until she gets
- 3 re-deposed, I'm surprised it hasn't happened yet, but
- 4 that you're to treat her as if she were on
- 5 cross-examination. That does not apply to getting
- 6 her to sign a verification. So submit them to her.
- 7 If she's willing to sign it, fine. If she's not
- 8 willing to sign it as you've prepared it, ask her to
- 9 mark it up and send it back to you. Just do not
- 10 discuss the substance with her.
- 11 You're looking at meet strangely.
- 12 MR. ROTH: I am happy to do that, your
- 13 Honor. I'm happy to do that.
- 14 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Thank you.
- 15 As to the second set of interrogatories,
- 16 I'm going to ask for responsive answers as to
- 17 interrogatory number 1.
- 18 I am not going to address interrogatory
- 19 number 4. Frankly, I think that's something we need
- 20 not spend any time on.
- 21 On interrogatories 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8,
- 22 I'm going to ask you to respond to those and that the
- 23 response in respect of those be contemporaneous with
- 24 the filing of your class cert motion.
- 25 And as to the responses that are being

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 160 requested, which is again 1, 4, 12, and 13 as to the 1 2 first set of interrogatories, save for Miss Ware, who's 1, 4, 11, and 12, and interrogatory number 1 of 3 4 the second set, that those two be provided to counsel for BASF by the 29th of this month. 5 Is there anything else on this 6 7 application that we need to address? 8 MR. FARRELL: There's only the brief 9 procedural issue that the two plaintiffs who apparently are going to be substituted but have not 10 yet been substituted, it's frankly a function not 11 12 just of verification but also we're going to have 13 depositions commencing as early as early February, 14 and as we sit here today we don't apparently have two 15 plaintiffs to depose, so... 16 SPECIAL MASTER: Okav. When can you 17 file your substitution of parties? 18 MR. ROTH: There is an estate question 19 in Ohio, your Honor, the only thing that we were 20 waiting for. 2.1 SPECIAL MASTER: Is the estate question 22 being somebody being named as a representative? 23 MR. ROTH: That's right, your Honor, 24 somebody being substituted as a representative. 25 MR. PLACITELLA: And the surrogate

## Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 162 of 233 PageID: 48197

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 161 signing off or something. 1 2 SPECIAL MASTER: Right. Has the 3 surrogate -- do they call them that in Ohio? 4 MR. PLACITELLA: I don't know the exact 5 issue, but it's an estate issue. 6 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Surrogate's a New 7 Jersey term, so --8 It's the registrar of wills. MR. COHEN: 9 MR. ROTH: I believe it's the registrar of wills. 10 11 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. 12 MR. ROTH: And we're waiting for the 13 signing off of the new representatives of the estate 14 to substitute. It's not a function -- it's only a 15 function of --16 SPECIAL MASTER: It's ministerial, isn't 17 it? 18 MR. ROTH: Yes, your Honor. We can't 19 control the registrar of wills. 20 SPECIAL MASTER: Right. 2.1 MR. ROTH: But we know who it's going to 22 be. 23 SPECIAL MASTER: But since you know who 24 it's going to be, do your substitution as soon as you 25 can.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 163 of 233 PageID: 48198

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 162
1	MR. ROTH: Yes, your honor.
2	SPECIAL MASTER: I wouldn't if it's
3	just going to be a ministerial act, I wouldn't wait
4	for that.
5	MR. ROTH: As long as there would be no
6	objection.
7	SPECIAL MASTER: Right. And if there's
8	a problem later on, we'll fix it.
9	MR. ROTH: Okay. Thank you, your Honor.
10	SPECIAL MASTER: I don't think anybody's
11	going to have any trouble with that.
12	Now, just so you know, your filings are
13	limited to what a large binder clip can grab, because
14	that's as far as my ability the understand goes. I
15	much prefer the smaller clips.
16	But before we go into that, can I please
17	remind everybody, please double-space everything. I
18	have enough trouble reading Times New Roman 12 point
19	than having to read it in single-space.
20	I don't know if you noticed, but I have
21	trifocals, and it gets really bad when I actually
22	have to take my glasses off to read it.
23	Single-spaced letters are nice, but
24	they're hard to read. So if you could do
25	double-space, please, that would be nice.
1	

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 164 of 233 PageID: 48199

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 163
1	MR. COHEN: Still want the 14 font?
2	SPECIAL MASTER: As long as it's
3	double-spaced
4	MR. COHEN: 12 is okay?
5	SPECIAL MASTER: 14 yeah, 14 is
6	nice, but 12 I can live with. Either, you know, 14
7	proportional or 12 non-proportional. So I'm big fan
8	of Courier. It's easier to read for old people like
9	me.
10	Anyway that was the original one.
11	The last thing that I have is something
12	that has not been filed of record that was triggered
13	by Mr. Assaf's original e-mail saying that is it
14	today?
15	MR. ASSAF: Today.
16	SPECIAL MASTER: Today. Oh, big day
17	today.
18	That today BASF was going to be filing
19	their opposition to plaintiffs' motion to determine
20	the crime fraud exception and Kozlov exception to
21	defendant's assertions of attorney/client privilege.
22	In that e-mail Mr. Assaf noted that
23	there were two filings that they intended to make.
24	One was an unrestricted filing of an opposition brief
25	that they requested, if memory serves me, a 65 page

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 165 of 233 PageID: 48200

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 164 1 limitation on it. 2 Mr. Ryan on behalf of the Cahill Gordon 3 defendants had asked for a 70 page. 4 Both of those applications were granted. 5 Just make sure they're a good 65 and 70 pages. 6 But in his e-mail Mr. Assaf further 7 advised that there was a separate submission he 8 intended to make, about 220 pages' worth, that he 9 intended to submit on an exparte basis for review in 10 camera. That triggered a letter dated January 11 12 the 12th, 2018, from Mr. Placitella objecting to the 13 filing of the ex parte and under seal submission, 14 stating first that a secret brief, I like that term, 15 that's really nice, secret brief is unnecessary and 16 that it would only become relevant if there's a 17 determination that plaintiffs have met the prima 18 facie threshold. 19 I would have said when the Court 20 determines that you've met it. But I'm a little more 2.1 forward than you are. 22 And that there should be a hearing for 23 the parties to be heard on the procedure and that in 24 any event you receive a copy of this brief. 25 Let me specifically go to my notes where

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 I wrote that your letter provides that the secret
- 2 brief, I'm going to use that term because I like it,
- 3 not because it aptly describes it, but because it's
- 4 colorful, is not relevant, it is unnecessary, and it
- 5 violates plaintiffs' due process and fair trial
- 6 rights.
- 7 Mr. Placitella suggests that we consider
- 8 the state court's special discovery master's reports
- 9 and the state crime fraud evidentiary record, that
- 10 plaintiffs be provided with specific documents in the
- 11 ex parte submission, and that plaintiffs be allowed
- 12 to review and oppose BASF's submission or file their
- 13 own documents in rebuttal.
- On January the 14th, which I will point
- out once again was Sunday, January the 14th, during
- 16 playoff games, BASF filed its letter in opposition
- 17 that stated as follows. Number 1, that the Court
- 18 had already rejected the request to review the crime
- 19 fraud decisions in the Samson case, that the request
- 20 of the plaintiffs to review the ex parte submission
- 21 is inappropriate, that the request for BASF's
- 22 specific documents or a list thereof or be allowed to
- 23 submit their own document list in opposition has no
- 24 basis, and talked about the timing of the BASF ex
- 25 parte brief.

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 167 of 233 PageID: 48202

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 166 1 By letter dated January 14, 2018, 2 reminding again it was a Sunday during -- I think this one arrived just as the Vikings were scoring 3 4 their last touchdown, that Cahill Gordon opposes it, 5 they join in BASF's opposition, and said that they 6 would withhold filing their opposition due today 7 until they get additional guidance. 8 Let me just tell you sort of where I come out on it because I think it would help 9 10 everybody. Attorney/client privilege issues are 11 12 tricky to handle, because once the horse is out of 13 the barn, the horse is out of the barn. And so they have to be dealt with, with a little bit of tact and 14 15 consideration for the issues that are at play. 16 As a result, the judiciary, both federal 17 and state, have developed pretty much a template on 18 how they are to be handled. 19 You have a party that asserts that they're entitled to discovery for a certain reason, 20 an opposition that says no, they're not because it's 2.1 22 privileged for the following reasons. 23 And at some point or another somebody's 24 got to look at documents and say they are or they are not privileged, number 1, and number 2, if they are 25

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 168 of 233 PageID: 48203

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 167 1 privileged, does the privilege bar their disclosure. 2 So it's really a two-step process. the way that it is normally done, or at least in my 3 4 experience the way that it's normally done is that 5 somebody requests the discovery. The possessor of 6 the privileged document says: No, you can't have 7 them because they're privileged, and then submits at 8 the same time an ex parte submission for the decision maker to decide, number 1, are they privileged in the 9 first instance, and if they are, has that privilege 10 been waived by either operation of law or by fact. 11 12 And the allegation here is that the 13 privilege has been waived because of the crime fraud 14 exception and/or the Kozlov considerations. 15 In those circumstances, the person 16 seeking the information doesn't get to see the 17 privileged documents because that kind of lets the 18 cat out of the bag. 19 There are other ways of handling it that 20 I've seen and actually done that get a lot more 2.1 complicated, and that is, for example in this 22 instance, plaintiffs retaining a special conflicts 23 counsel who is then allowed to look at the documents 24 but cannot report on them back to you. 25 that's one way of doing it. I don't know if that's

## Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 169 of 233 PageID: 48204

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 168 1 what you want to do. 2 MR. PLACITELLA: So let me just try 3 to --4 I think you are that person. MR. ASSAF: Well, I am the decider. 5 SPECIAL MASTER: But normally, whoever 6 I'm not the advocate. Okay. 7 the decision maker is tries to occupy both. 8 But if you've got a party who says 9 basically I really don't trust you to make the right 10 decision, we'd like to have a dog in that fight, there are ways of organizing that in such a way where 11 12 it's insulated, whoever is performing the role 13 understands that they have what us old guys used to 14 call a Chinese wall, now is called a screening device 15 or mechanism that is not to be pierced. That's 16 another way of doing things. 17 MR. ASSAF: So my experience doing these 18 several times over -- more than I care to imagine 19 over 25 years, I haven't done the special master --20 SPECIAL MASTER: You should stop getting 2.1 into these messes. 22 MR. ASSAF: Is pretty much aligned with 23 how you laid out it, that there's an in camera 24 process -- especially in federal court, there's an in 25 camera process and the judge or magistrate or special

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 170 of 233 PageID: 48205

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 169 discovery master reviews it. And that I actually 1 2 think goes back to Chief Judge Linares' view in terms 3 of appointing you --4 SPECIAL MASTER: Yes. MR. ASSAF: -- and the characteristics 5 6 he was looking for. And I think it's even in his 7 order. 8 So I hesitate to add yet another person 9 to this as opposed to your Honor, who --10 **SPECIAL MASTER:** I'm not recommending it. 11 12 MR. ASSAF: Okay. 13 SPECIAL MASTER: I'm just saying if the 14 plaintiffs are really going to get crazed about it, 15 there's another way of providing another step of comfort. 16 17 That's not my issue. MR. PLACITELLA: 18 SPECIAL MASTER: I don't think you need 19 it. 20 MR. PLACITELLA: That's not my issue. 2.1 Okay. SPECIAL MASTER: 22 MR. PLACITELLA: As I understand it, 23 just so we're on the same page, and maybe we're all 24 on the same page, we were to provide and submit our 25 crime fraud brief to make out a prima facie case.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 171 of 233 PageID: 48206

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 170
1	And in that brief we had to refer only to stuff that
2	was in the public record. Right?
3	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, because we're in
4	the bizarre set of circumstances
5	MR. PLACITELLA: Yes.
6	SPECIAL MASTER: that in parallel
7	proceedings
8	MR. PLACITELLA: Right.
9	SPECIAL MASTER: you've had access to
10	stuff that you haven't had access to in this case and
11	that I haven't had access to in this case.
12	MR. PLACITELLA: Yeah, I'm not and
13	the purpose
14	SPECIAL MASTER: It's a unique set of
15	circumstances, we all agree.
16	MR. PLACITELLA: Right. And the purpose
17	of that submission and response was for you to
18	determine whether there was a prima facia case made
19	of crime fraud.
20	If there was if you find that there
21	is, then a couple of things a few things become in
22	play. One, at that point you get to review the
23	documents at issue in camera.
24	And I'm not looking to inject another
25	individual into the process.
1	

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 172 of 233 PageID: 48207

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 171
1	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
2	MR. PLACITELLA: Or you also have the
3	issue of, if we make out a prima facia case of a
4	crime fraud, do we get to take depositions of the
5	defendants under a 502(d) order to ask them certain
6	questions to fill it out? That's what I thought was
7	at issue. Now, because
8	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, the only
9	thing that is at issue
10	MR. ASSAF: That's never been an issue.
11	SPECIAL MASTER: The only thing that is
12	at issue right now based on your January 12th letter
13	is the submission of the ex parte provision
14	MR. PLACITELLA: Yes.
15	SPECIAL MASTER: that Mr. Assaf
16	referred to, about 220 pages, which I assume is
17	pretty much all documents.
18	MR. PLACITELLA: Well, that's what I
19	want to address.
20	<b>SPECIAL MASTER:</b> Okay.
21	MR. PLACITELLA: If it's just documents,
22	that's one thing. If there is advocacy attached to
23	that submission, that's wrong. They shouldn't be
24	able to
25	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Is it all

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 173 of 233 PageID: 48208

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 172 1 documents or advocacy? 2 MR. PLACITELLA: Let me just -- if 3 there's advocacy attached to that submission, then we 4 need to participate. And frankly, I thought the easier way to do it would be, if you find a prima 5 6 facie case, we'll identify for you the documents we 7 think you should look at. We don't think you need to 8 look at a thousand documents. You may only have to look at 75 documents. 9 If they believe that there are another 10 10 documents that you should look at to round out the 11 12 picture, so be it. 13 But it shouldn't be that they give you a 14 220 page set of documents, many of which we don't 15 care about or are not challenging, and it shouldn't 16 be that they have a chance to advocate in absentia 17 that issue. 18 **SPECIAL MASTER:** You're saying that 19 because you're in the sort of odd position where 20 you've already gotten this discovery in a different 2.1 case --22 MR. PLACITELLA: I know what the 23 documents say. 24 SPECIAL MASTER: Well --25 MR. ASSAF: Some of them.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 174 of 233 PageID: 48209

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 173
1	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
2	MR. PLACITELLA: Well, if I don't
3	know what they all say, then that's a concern.
4	SPECIAL MASTER: You're not answering my
5	question. My question is do you know what the
6	documents have you seen the documents that you
7	want me to rule on?
8	MR. PLACITELLA: Yes.
9	SPECIAL MASTER: You have copies of
10	those?
11	MR. PLACITELLA: Not in the context of
12	this case.
13	SPECIAL MASTER: No, no. But you have
14	copies of those?
15	MR. PLACITELLA: Yes.
16	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. And they are
17	subject to whatever the state court proceedings in
18	the Samson case have put in the way of restrictions?
19	MR. PLACITELLA: I'm not sure what I'm
20	allowed to say here or not say, so I want to be very
21	careful.
22	I didn't want to get to I read the
23	document, this is what it says. All I wanted to do
24	was go to the privilege log and say to you, I only
25	want you to I want you to look at the following
1	

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 174 documents on the privilege log, like I would do in 1 2 any other case, pretending as best I can that I don't 3 know anything. 4 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. 5 May I respond? MR. ASSAF: 6 SPECIAL MASTER: That is a lot more 7 helpful than honestly I thought. 8 MR. PLACITELLA: Okay. My concern is 9 that they give you the documents they want you to 10 look at, they're not even the documents --11 SPECIAL MASTER: That you're interested 12 in. 13 MR. PLACITELLA: -- that I care about 14 and it's attached to some piece of advocacy that I 15 can't rebut and I can't get the left side of my brain 16 away from my right side, knowing that if I knew what documents they gave you, then I could kind of get a 17 18 sense of where things were going. It's an issue. 19 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Okay. Just so that I 20 understand, I understand that your motion for the 2.1 application of the crime fraud exception and/or the 22 Kozlov exceptions is going to be limited to a finite 23 number of documents that you already know which ones 24 they are? 25 MR. PLACITELLA: I'm assuming -yes.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 176 of 233 PageID: 48211

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 175
1	Yes.
2	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. What's wrong
3	with that procedure?
4	MR. ASSAF: So
5	MR. PLACITELLA: And the ability if you
6	find crime fraud then to take you know, I have to
7	take the depositions at some point.
8	SPECIAL MASTER: Right. We'll jump off
9	that bridge when we get to it.
10	MR. ASSAF: Here's what wrong with that
11	procedure, your Honor. And you're going to see this
12	when you look even at our public brief tonight or
13	tomorrow now, that the well-established case law
14	within the Third Circuit and virtually every other
15	federal court I know of says when it's beyond
16	dispute when a challenging party moves to challenge
17	attorney/client privilege on crime fraud grounds, and
18	Mr. Placitella's partially right, they have an
19	obligation to identify the 20 to 40 documents on the
20	privilege log that they would like your Honor to do
21	so. Okay. Court after court
22	SPECIAL MASTER: Just let me stop you
23	for one moment.
24	Did you do that
25	MR. ASSAF: No.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 177 of 233 PageID: 48212

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 176
1	SPECIAL MASTER on your initial
2	submission?
3	MR. PLACITELLA: I didn't because I
4	didn't think that's what you wanted. I thought what
5	you wanted was how do we make a prima facie case of
6	crime fraud? And if you make that determination,
7	then we'll go to the step of me telling you what
8	documents to look at.
9	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
10	MR. ASSAF: But, your Honor, from the
11	very first time at the October 25th hearing that you
12	brought this up
13	<b>SPECIAL MASTER:</b> 26th.
14	MR. ASSAF: 26th hearing that you
15	brought this up, you talked about the fact that we're
16	in the Third Circuit, the Third Circuit laws control.
17	And the Third Circuit is pretty clear.
18	You as a charging party has an obligation.
19	Now, Mr. Placitella's been at this a
20	long time. He failed there's an abject failure of
21	proof on that. So where are we? So
22	SPECIAL MASTER: Which I assume is going
23	to be amply briefed in your submission.
23 24	to be amply briefed in your submission.  MR. ASSAF: Correct. It will be in our
	-

## Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 178 of 233 PageID: 48213

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 177 1 But I also heard your Honor, including 2 today, say: Yeah, I think there's probably going to 3 be a prima facie case. 4 So I was going to submit everything, 5 because I thought you'd want to kick the tires. 6 SPECIAL MASTER: I hope I didn't say 7 I hope I never said I think there's going to that. 8 be a prima facie case, because I will tell you right now, I try very hard not to prejudge anything. 9 10 MR. ASSAF: Fair enough, your Honor. And so for me what's 11 SPECIAL MASTER: 12 important is to give all of you the opportunity to 13 have your say. And I think today is more evidence 14 of that. 15 MR. ASSAF: Correct. 16 SPECIAL MASTER: You're going to get the 17 opportunity to have your say. And at some point I'm 18 going to decide, for no other reason than somebody's 19 got to decide something along the way. 20 MR. ASSAF: Agree completely. 2.1 SPECIAL MASTER: So putting that to the 22 side, we just heard from Mr. Placitella that what he 23 would like to have happen is you file your opposition brief, he files his reply brief, I make a 24 determination on whether a prima facie case has been 25

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 179 of 233 PageID: 48214

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 178 1 made. 2 If I find that a prima facie case --If I conclude that a prima facie case has 3 sorry. 4 been made, then Mr. Placitella is going to give me a finite number of documents that he -- and he's not 5 6 going to ask for anything else. He's going to give 7 me a finite number of documents, that he's going to 8 say: Since you found a prima facie case, please determine these. 9 You're going to then respond: -- this 10 is what he's proposing. You're going to then 11 12 respond. And your response doesn't have to be 13 limited to those. You can say there are these other 14 privileged documents that he's not asking for that give a different view of what that document is all 15 16 about. And if it's privileged, you're going to be able to submit it ex parte. 17 And that's a risk that Mr. Placitella 18 19 runs, that you're going to be able to rebut with 20 something that he hasn't seen. 2.1 Although my guess is that by this point 22 in this case, pretty much everyone has seen a lot of 23 everything. 24 I'm going to tell you right up front the 25 proposal that I review, the special master's reports

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 and those decisions, until somebody tells me that the
- 2 Supreme Court has lifted the stay, I don't want to
- 3 see any of that.
- 4 MR. PLACITELLA: I figured you would say
- 5 that.
- 6 SPECIAL MASTER: Until the Court lifts
- 7 the stay, I don't want to be there.
- 8 MR. PLACITELLA: I understand.
- 9 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Okay.
- 10 MR. ASSAF: So your Honor, my biggest
- 11 point is coming back to I'm going to live with
- 12 whatever the standard is with the Third Circuit. And
- 13 the Third Circuit standard says when he moves, he has
- 14 to identify the documents.
- Now, he didn't do so, your Honor.
- 16 Okay. And we're now months down the road from when
- 17 he was supposed to. Okay. That's not how this
- 18 works. Okay. If we're going to play by the
- 19 rules --
- 20 **SPECIAL MASTER:** So you're going to put
- 21 it in your opposition. And he's going to put it in
- 22 his reply.
- 23 MR. ASSAF: But not with the document --
- 24 but not -- he can't -- in other words --
- 25 **SPECIAL MASTER:** If you want --

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 181 of 233 PageID: 48216

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 180 1 MR. ASSAF: -- the last three months 2 would have been much different for me. 3 **SPECIAL MASTER:** I'm sure that is 4 the case. 5 MR. ASSAF: I can't on the eve of my 6 opposition, your Honor, find out that now he's going 7 to get to start over again. **SPECIAL MASTER:** It's not the eve. 8 It's the day of your opposition. 9 10 MR. ASSAF: Correct. But, your Honor, that's fundamentally unfair. He knows what the 11 12 standard is and he didn't do it. And now on Friday 13 night --14 **SPECIAL MASTER:** But I can fix that. Ι 15 mean, I can fix that by giving you the opportunity to 16 file a sur-reply. So I can fix that. That's not 17 that big of a problem. 18 If that is the procedure that Mr. 19 Placitella follows and in his reply he identifies the 20 documents that he wants, then you can -- the whole 2.1 purpose of a reply is to fix problems that have been 22 brought up in an opposition. 23 And you want to be able to respond to 24 I'll give you leave to file a sur-reply, 25 which as those of you who have practiced before the

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 District of New Jersey know, that's not granted
- 2 often.
- 3 But you're not going to be prejudiced.
- 4 I'm telling you that right now. It's not going to
- 5 happen.
- 6 MR. ASSAF: Well, your Honor, I kind of
- 7 feel like I am, so I'm sorry. But on Friday night I
- 8 get a piece from Mr. Placitella saying: Well, here's
- 9 what I want to do.
- 10 And then on Monday we come in here and
- 11 we argue it. And for the very first time he now
- 12 comes to grips with he failed to follow a Third
- 13 Circuit law. And I'm being told: Well, it's kind
- of -- don't worry, you'll get another brief on it.
- 15 Okay.
- I've strategized this with co-counsel,
- 17 with my client, and I'm being told now: Well, you'll
- 18 get another shot at it, when if anything, again, I
- 19 followed what the Third Circuit told me. And I
- 20 shouldn't have that changed.
- 21 Under the rights standard, with all due
- 22 respect, your Honor, I'm going to win this.
- 23 And so -- but I just want the rights
- 24 standard. I don't think Mr. Placitella should get to
- 25 change the procedure the day I file my brief.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 183 of 233 PageID: 48218

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 182				
1	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.				
2	MR. PLACITELLA: It's my understanding				
3	this is how you wanted to do it.				
4	MR. ASSAF: Under what case?				
5	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, I don't				
6	MR. PLACITELLA: I could have been				
7	wrong.				
8	SPECIAL MASTER: I don't know where you				
9	got that from.				
10	But be that as it may, Mr. Ryan, who's				
11	been here all day long listening to us go on and on				
12	and on, what have you to add?				
13	MR. RYAN: On behalf of the Cahill				
14	defendants, your Honor, I think that we're maybe				
15	over-thinking this issue a little bit.				
16	I appreciate that Mr. Placitella was				
17	involved in the Samson matter, but we all need to				
18	remember that Cahill was not a party in the Samson				
19	matter.				
20	The reality of life is that Mr. Assaf is				
21	correct, that there's a well set of established law				
22	in the Third Circuit with regard to how this process				
23	is supposed to play out. Mr. Placitella files his				
24	motion, the defendants get to file a reply, and your				
25	Honor gets to decide the issue before we even get to				

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 in camera. So that's my concern.
- 2 And as counsel for Cahill, obviously we
- 3 have other issues because we have to respect the
- 4 privilege.
- 5 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, work this out
- 6 with me, Mr. Ryan, if you would. The objection that
- 7 is being interposed right now is a purely procedural
- 8 one. It's one that says this is the process that
- 9 should have been followed, it was not followed, and
- 10 therefore the application should be denied.
- 11 What if the procedural problem is cured?
- 12 Am I to ignore that and simply decide on the
- 13 procedural issue? Or should I say the procedural
- 14 issue can give way to a determination of the
- 15 substance, particularly in a case like this where the
- 16 substance is pretty serious.
- I say that only because that's what's
- 18 being alleged. I'm not making a determination one
- 19 way or the other that that's the end result.
- 20 And the fact that I'm here and doing
- 21 this, you know, it's not the typical case that gets a
- 22 special master assigned. And it's not the typical
- 23 case that gets somebody like me appointed as special
- 24 master.
- 25 MR. ASSAF: Correct.

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 185 of 233 PageID: 48220

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 184 1 SPECIAL MASTER: Because there are 2 important considerations that are at play here that 3 are important to everybody. And they are 4 considerations that go to the heart of what we do as 5 lawyers. 6 And I've said it before and I will say 7 I have nothing but the utmost respect for it again. 8 our profession. I jokingly say that if you want 9 proof of that is the fact that I married a lawyer and 38 years later we'll still married. 10 So it is something that is very near and dear to my heart. 11 12 The allegations in this case, I think if 13 anybody looks at them objectively, they are 14 troubling, but they're just allegations. 15 So I have to make sure that everybody in this room and everybody, you know, on the telephone 16 17 gets a fair shake in this case. 18 And under those circumstances, don't you 19 think I absolutely have to? 20 MR. RYAN: Respectfully, I don't, and 2.1 it's for this reason, your Honor. One, this case has 22 been bubbling around for six or seven years. Mr. 23 Placitella and his firm are fine lawyers. 24 By the pure magnitude of the motion that 25 was filed, you can tell it was well researched, well

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 thought out. If it's fatally flawed, I don't think
- 2 you get to do a do-over.
- I think Mr. Assaf and his clients are
- 4 here today apparently ready to file their brief
- 5 today. And I don't think it's fair to say, okay,
- 6 well, there's a, you know, a little procedural
- 7 misstep here and we're going to flip out the process
- 8 that the Third Circuit has used, flip out the process
- 9 that New Jersey has used, and we're going to add
- 10 another step. After BASF and Cahill submit their
- 11 briefs, now plaintiff can backfill and fix a fatal
- 12 flaw in their submission.
- This isn't the case I think, candidly,
- 14 Judge, where you have a minor procedural misstep that
- 15 your Honor with his equity powers can fix and bring
- 16 us all back. This one isn't like that.
- We've all been litigating this
- 18 particular case way too long. The issue is teed up.
- 19 And I think your Honor should candidly
- 20 follow the procedure that the courts have set,
- 21 because I think when you do, you're going to find
- 22 there was no prima facie case.
- 23 **SPECIAL MASTER:** I don't disagree with
- 24 you, Mr. Ryan.
- 25 But when I look at it, there are to

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 me -- and I think I've mentioned this before, there
- 2 are two other than that, Mrs. Lincoln, how did you
- 3 like the play issues in this case. One is this
- 4 motion. The second one is class cert.
- 5 I think either of those -- the
- 6 determination in respect of either of those will have
- 7 a fundamental effect on this case and how it goes
- 8 forward.
- 9 I'm just being very candid with you that
- 10 I am a little troubled, at least at the first
- instance, with deciding a motion of such gravity
- 12 solely on a procedural shortcoming.
- But if I understood your response
- 14 yesterday, Mr. Assaf, it was: Listen, the only time
- 15 you're going to need to reach my ex parte brief is if
- 16 you find that a prima facie case has been made.
- 17 So I'm going to ask you -- and I think
- 18 I've paraphrased exactly what you said.
- 19 So I'm going to ask you to do me this
- 20 favor. File your public brief. Hold the other one
- 21 in abeyance until there's a determination on whether
- 22 a prima facie case has been made.
- 23 And then we can go from there, unless
- 24 you need it as part of your opposition to the prima
- 25 facie case, which is not what you told me in your

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 188 of 233 PageID:

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 187 1 letter. 2 MR. ASSAF: I'm sorry, say that again, 3 your Honor. 4 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, unless you need 5 your 220 page ex parte brief to argue --6 MR. ASSAF: Oh, yeah. Okay. I hear 7 you. 8 SPECIAL MASTER: Unless you need that, 9 but that's not what you told me. But unless you need 10 that, I would ask you to just hold off on it, let me make a determination on the prima facie case first, 11 12 and then we'll see where that takes us. 13 MR. ASSAF: So a couple reactions, your 14 First of all, I want to be clear, I know Honor. 15 we've been talking about a procedural issue. I think 16 it's more than procedural, just to be fair, and it's going to be raised in our brief. 17 18 There are substantive deficiencies, as 19 your Honor I think pointed out in the first hearing. 20 Law's well settled that they have to make a Okay. prima facie in showing activity in furtherance of a 2.1 22 crime or a fraud. 23 So it's not just procedural of 24 identifying the documents. It has to be then the 25 substantive arguments in furtherance of. Okay.

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 188
1	And again, it's not since the brief
2	is done I'll tell you. Mr. Placitella doesn't want
3	to engage on the in furtherance of. He's trying to
4	say, well, it could be a different standard, it might
5	be a different standard.
6	And there are reasons for that. I think
7	your Honor will figure it out. Doesn't like the
8	standard. Okay. But the Third Circuit does.
9	SPECIAL MASTER: I'll do my best.
10	MR. ASSAF: But the Third Circuit does
11	like the standard.
12	So now, in terms of then the public
13	brief and the prima facie case, again, your Honor, I
14	think I just I'd like to have a break of about
15	five minutes to talk to Mr. Farrell about it and get
16	back to you.
17	SPECIAL MASTER: Sure. You may want to
18	talk to Mr. Ryan also.
19	MR. ASSAF: And Mr. Ryan as well.
20	SPECIAL MASTER: He seems to be in your
21	camp.
22	MR. ASSAF: But I'm just trying to
23	SPECIAL MASTER: Unless, Mr. Ryan, you
24	don't want to talk to these guys, which I wouldn't
25	blame you.
1	

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 189 1 So I'm just to trying to MR. ASSAF: 2 figure out then what the process would be, that we would file our public brief and Mr. Placitella would 3 4 file a reply as to why he thinks either the standard isn't in furtherance of or why he didn't have to 5 6 review -- identify the documents as opposed to start 7 over. 8 **SPECIAL MASTER:** If he files a reply 9 that goes outside the four corners of your opposition, you will get the right to file a 10 11 sur-reply. How's that? 12 MR. ASSAF: Okay. Let me talk to Mr. 13 Farrell about that, if that's okay. 14 SPECIAL MASTER: Talk to Mr. Farrell. 15 MR. ASSAF: And Mr. Ryan. 16 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Let's take a 17 couple minute break. 18 (Break.) 19 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Mr. Placitella? 20 MR. PLACITELLA: So maybe there's a 2.1 different way to approach this that works for 22 everybody. 23 It was truly our understanding that we 24 were to approach it the way we did. And out of the 25 abundance of caution and great concern not to tread

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- on the sealing orders in Samson, maybe we went
- 2 overboard and did not even mention a document under
- 3 seal, only information that was outside -- you know,
- 4 on the record.
- 5 SPECIAL MASTER: That's your reply,
- 6 isn't it?
- 7 MR. PLACITELLA: Right. Well, but there
- 8 might be an easier way to shortcut all this.
- 9 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Okay.
- 10 MR. PLACITELLA: And the simple way I
- 11 think to handle it is give us three days. We'll give
- 12 them the list of documents before they make their
- 13 submission. And then they can make -- you know, give
- 14 them some extra time to make their submission. And
- 15 they can make their submission. And then we don't
- 16 have to, you know, do the extra dance, because we can
- 17 do it very quickly, if that's what the Court wants.
- 18 SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. Assaf, you want to
- 19 think about that for a moment or just reject it out
- 20 of hand?
- 21 MR. ASSAF: Well, I think I'm going to
- 22 reject it out of hand because -- so, you know, I
- 23 think what you're hearing -- again, now I will put my
- 24 advocacy hat on.
- 25 I think Mr. Placitella realizes he's in

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 a boatload of trouble under Haines and Liggett in the
- 2 Third Circuit and that by failing to identify -- he's
- 3 familiar with the California cases that have ruled on
- 4 this very issue.
- 5 So we will submit our brief. I think,
- 6 your Honor, we've heard about what you said.
- 7 I've now been looking at e-mails. Mr.
- 8 Placitella's brief is pretty clear that they think it
- 9 was just a broad, you know, you get to examine all
- 10 communications.
- 11 SPECIAL MASTER: Don't tell me what your
- 12 brief is going to say that hasn't yet been filed.
- 13 MR. ASSAF: So in terms -- we'll see
- 14 what Mr. Placitella's reply says. And then we'll
- 15 take up your sur-reply, your Honor. But to be
- 16 clear --
- 17 **SPECIAL MASTER:** You're going to look at
- 18 his reply and you're going to let me know whether you
- 19 want to file --
- 20 MR. ASSAF: Correct.
- 21 **SPECIAL MASTER:** -- more importantly,
- 22 whether you need to file --
- 23 MR. ASSAF: Correct.
- 24 SPECIAL MASTER -- a sur-reply. And I'll
- 25 deal with it.

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 193 of 233 PageID: 48228

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

Page 192 1 I'll tell you right now, if the reply 2 goes outside the four corners of the opposition, 3 you're going to have time to file a sur-reply. 4 MR. ASSAF: And then, your Honor, I 5 didn't answer a question that you posed to me before and I want to answer it because I don't want to --6 7 SPECIAL MASTER: That's why we took the 8 break. 9 MR. ASSAF: Correct. 10 SPECIAL MASTER: Okav. There's another question 11 MR. ASSAF: 12 that came up about whether it was advocacy or just 13 non-advocacy. 14 And again, your Honor, this is going to 15 be in our public brief. But the Third Circuit in 16 Haines v. Liggett says, quote, that there's an absolutely right to have evidence and argument in 17 18 camera. 19 So I don't want you to think that I'm 20 not going to be an advocate. 2.1 **SPECIAL MASTER:** In camera. Not ex 22 There's a difference. In camera. parte. 23 MR. ASSAF: There is a difference, your 24 But I think, again, the cases are going to be 25 in our public brief and you'll rule on this. But we

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 have a chance to make this -- it doesn't have -- I'm
- 2 going to be an advocate, whether it be in camera or
- 3 under seal or just privileged.
- 4 SPECIAL MASTER: I expect nothing less
- 5 from you, Mr. Assaf.
- 6 **MR. ASSAF:** Okay.
- 7 SPECIAL MASTER: You would disappoint me
- 8 gravely if you weren't.
- 9 MR. ASSAF: And then --
- 10 **SPECIAL MASTER:** There's one thing that
- 11 you do know, and that is whatever you submit, I will
- 12 read it from cover to cover, including all the cases
- 13 that you cite.
- 14 MR. ASSAF: That I know.
- 15 **SPECIAL MASTER:** So you're going to get
- 16 your fair shot.
- 17 MR. ASSAF: That I know. And I will
- 18 also picked up more data today. The Irving Younger
- 19 piece explains a lot.
- 20 **SPECIAL MASTER:** That's another hundred
- 21 thousand dollars worth of psychiatric treatment.
- 22 MR. ASSAF: So your Honor, but the
- 23 one -- the other thing that you mentioned because of
- 24 now the prima facie determination, I would ask your
- 25 Honor to consider the following, that to the extent

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 your Honor after a full briefing determines that
- 2 there is a prima facie case and then we go to the
- 3 next step in the crime fraud, I would ask that that
- 4 ruling be held just to the parties until your final
- 5 ruling on the crime fraud. And then that would be
- 6 made as part of the public record.
- 7 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Okay.
- 8 MR. PLACITELLA: I have to think about
- 9 that, our position on that.
- 10 SPECIAL MASTER: Why would you object to
- 11 that?
- 12 MR. PLACITELLA: I want to think about
- 13 it.
- 14 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. You're going to
- 15 think about it and then agree that you're not going
- 16 to object. All right.
- 17 MR. ASSAF: And then finally, your
- 18 Honor, I'm sorry about this, but it is --
- 19 **SPECIAL MASTER:** I'm trying to help you
- 20 out.
- 21 MR. ASSAF: It is three o'clock, and so
- 22 I would ask for another 24 hours to submit our public
- 23 brief, because I would like a chance to now review it
- 24 again. It's gone through some changes over the
- 25 weekend given the uncertainty of how we're going to

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 196 of 233 PageID: 48231

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al.
Oral Argument

	Page 195
1	file.
2	SPECIAL MASTER: Is 24 hours enough for
3	you?
4	MR. ASSAF: Yes, it is.
5	SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. Ryan?
6	MR. RYAN: I would ask the same thing,
7	your Honor. And I would just reiterate that to the
8	extent that this process goes any further, it is my
9	view candidly that the in camera process does permit
10	submissions both on behalf of BASF and Cahill which
11	are ex parte, because we have to protect the
12	privilege. And my position will be that Mr.
13	Placitella and his clients are not entitled to those.
14	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, and not to tell
15	tales out of school, but you're right, because what's
16	the alternative?
17	MR. RYAN: Correct.
18	SPECIAL MASTER: You let the cat out of
19	the bag. And clearly it can't be that.
20	So are you going to hold off on the
21	that was my request of you. You haven't answered my
22	request.
23	MR. ASSAF: Hold off on?
24	SPECIAL MASTER: Hold off on your I
25	love the term secret brief.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 197 of 233 PageID: 48232

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 196
1	MR. ASSAF: Yes. And yes, I anticipate
2	that that would be part of any
3	SPECIAL MASTER: Phase 2.
4	MR. ASSAF: Phase 2, correct, your
5	Honor.
6	SPECIAL MASTER: If we ever got to phase
7	2.
8	MR. ASSAF: Correct.
9	MR. ROTH: Just so we're clear over
10	here, I understand you're going to be an advocate.
11	But are you saying that this secret brief is not just
12	a compilation of documents, but also an advocacy
13	piece in there as well?
14	MR. ASSAF: Well, just to be clear, your
15	Honor, it's an advocacy piece, but it's also factual
16	support from by the form of affidavits.
17	SPECIAL MASTER: And that's the 220
18	pages in the aggregate. So you've got a brief with
19	certifications that total 220 pages.
20	MR. ASSAF: We have 220 pages of
21	briefing supported by because every time we make a
22	citation
23	SPECIAL MASTER: Now, you just know that
24	my heart stopped when you said 220 pages of briefing.
25	MR. ASSAF: That's why I was glad when

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 you were saying that you read everything and you're
- 2 hard-working. I was like: This is perfect for it.
- 3 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, we all have
- 4 limits. The word brief means more than just a
- 5 filing. It means it ought to be brief.
- 6 MR. ASSAF: It does, but --
- 7 SPECIAL MASTER: Do you know why they're
- 8 called briefs?
- 9 MR. ASSAF: No.
- 10 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Because at common law
- 11 lawyers were paid by the word. That's why they were
- 12 called briefs. They were supposed to be brief,
- which I guess that meaning has been lost. 220 pages
- 14 is not brief.
- 15 MR. COHEN: I had a professor that I
- 16 couldn't call them briefs, I had to call them
- 17 memorandum.
- 18 MR. PLACITELLA: At the right time we'll
- 19 be heard about the length and the court rule.
- 20 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, we'll address all
- 21 of this. As I said before, this is one of the two
- 22 other than that, Mrs. Lincoln, how did you like the
- 23 play issues in this case. It's going to define in
- large measure the contours of this case, where it
- 25 goes and how it's handled.

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 199 of 233 PageID: 48234

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 198 1 So as you can see from the liberality 2 with which I quickly granted your request for longer 3 briefs, I'm not going to limit anybody. 4 I will tell you that as a consumer of 5 briefs, once a brief exceeds a certain page 6 limitation, you start to lose your reader. 7 But that's your call to make. 8 will honor whatever way you want to do it. That's perfectly fine with me. But please do take some 9 10 pity on this poor soul. 11 MR. ASSAF: Thank you, your Honor. 12 SPECIAL MASTER: At some point they may 13 have to respond to that, you know. And then it just 14 gets on and on and on. 15 So I'm not saying no. But please give 16 it some thought. 17 MR. ASSAF: Okay. 18 SPECIAL MASTER: And I'm sure you 19 understand that in addition to whatever -- this is a 20 big issue. Let me start from there. It's a big 2.1 issue. 22 So you can rest assured that in addition 23 to whatever you submit to me, I'm going to do my own 24 research, because I have to get this right. 25 I've already pulled the ABA single volume on

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 attorney/client privilege. It's a three volume set.
- 2 But the first volume deals with just the
- 3 attorney/client privilege. I already pulled that to
- 4 the side. And I intend to read that from cover to
- 5 cover before I start determining the application.
- 6 So that's just one of the things, the
- 7 source materials that I intend to look at.
- 8 Again, it's a big issue. And it's
- 9 going to be given the dignity it deserves.
- 10 **MR. ASSAF:** Thank you, your Honor.
- 11 That's all we can ask.
- 12 MR. RYAN: I just want to make sure I
- 13 understand, your Honor.
- So BASF is going to file its public
- 15 brief, non-privileged information. We're permitted
- 16 to do the same?
- 17 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Tomorrow.
- 18 MR. RYAN: Tomorrow. And then Chris
- 19 will submit his --
- 20 **SPECIAL MASTER:** His reply.
- 21 MR. RYAN: Just from a pure housekeeping
- 22 standpoint, there's no sealing order as far I'm aware
- 23 in place right now.
- 24 SPECIAL MASTER: No.
- 25 MR. RYAN: I presume BASF is going to

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 201 of 233 PageID: 48236

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

Page 200 1 file on ECF. I don't know. 2 MR. ASSAF: Yeah. 3 MR. RYAN: But we should probably have a 4 conversation about the logistics of this, because 5 right now there's no sealing order. 6 And my view of the world would have been 7 candidly to file some kind of bookmarks that just 8 indicate that the submissions have been made to your Honor as part of the process rather than filing them 9 10 on the ECF now. SPECIAL MASTER: If you prefer to do 11 12 that, that's fine. As you well know, you can just 13 file a bookmark that takes a docket entry and sort of 14 reserves it for you. And then you file whatever 15 you're filing directly. 16 Normally that's the process you follow 17 when something's being filed under seal, because 18 normally what the clerk's office does is the clerk's 19 office makes that entry for you. 20 MR. RYAN: Right. 2.1 SPECIAL MASTER: But since electronic 22 filing, we've kind of made the clerk's office a 23 little irrelevant in that respect. And it then 24 becomes the obligation of the lawyers to do it. 25 If you think that there is material in

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 your opposition briefs that you don't want the world
- 2 at large to see, I'm okay with you docketing a
- 3 bookmark and just sending the brief to me. I'm okay
- 4 with that.
- 5 At some point it's going to have to
- 6 become part of the public record at some point,
- 7 because if whoever is aggrieved by whatever decision
- 8 I make is going to seek review, and the only way for
- 9 it to be reviewed is for it to become part of the
- 10 public record. So, you know, that's -- but that's
- 11 for a different day.
- 12 If your preference is to file a bookmark
- and file the brief itself privately, I don't have any
- 14 problem with that. That's perfectly fine with me.
- 15 If you read your opposition brief and
- 16 it's not one that deserves to be, you know, put on
- 17 double secret probation, then that's fine. That's
- 18 your call to make. I'm okay either way.
- 19 However you think is best for you works
- 20 fine with me, as long as I've got a docket entry,
- 21 which I don't have for this letter, and the
- 22 responses. But that's okay. We'll finesse that.
- But as long as I have a docket entry
- 24 that I can make reference to later on so that people
- 25 who review it know that this stuff didn't just fly in

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument Monday January 15, 2018

- 1 over the transom, and I have the ability to complete
- 2 the record if necessary for review, I'm fine with
- 3 whatever works for you guys. You don't need to air
- 4 your laundry in public. It's not necessary as far as
- 5 I'm concerned.
- 6 MR. RYAN: Thank you.
- 7 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Have we heard anything
- 8 at all from the Supreme Court on the pending motion?
- 9 MR. PLACITELLA: It's pending. They
- 10 only got all the briefing I think in mid to late
- 11 December.
- 12 **SPECIAL MASTER:** Oh, then it's going to
- 13 be a while.
- 14 MR. PLACITELLA: I don't know what their
- 15 first conference date is.
- 16 SPECIAL MASTER: Doesn't matter, because
- 17 that's not what determines it. What determines it is
- 18 motions -- I think I know a little bit about this.
- 19 Motions before the Supreme Court are
- 20 actually reviewed by the Supreme Court Clerk's
- 21 Office. They don't go to the Justices for a law
- 22 clerk to create a memo. There are staff lawyers in
- 23 the clerk's office who review all of the motions.
- 24 And they actually prepare what is in essence the
- 25 bench memo in respect of that motion.

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 204 of 233 PageID: 48239

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al.
Oral Argument

	Page 203
1	And when that process is completed, then
2	the clerk of the court calendars it before the Court
3	during a conference.
4	And it's all a function of how much work
5	the staff lawyers have. More importantly, how much
6	work that particular staff lawyer has as to when it's
7	going to be percolated up.
8	I've seen them take several months to
9	come up, because obviously the moment that an
10	emergent application comes in, everything else has to
11	get put to the side. And you would be surprised how
12	many of those there are.
13	MR. ASSAF: Well, the emergent
14	application was granted, right, the stay?
15	MR. PLACITELLA: Well, it was consented
16	to, wasn't it?
17	MR. ASSAF: Yeah, but a Justice signed
18	it.
19	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, normally an
20	emergent application is through a single Justice,
21	even if it's
22	MR. PLACITELLA: Well, it was consented
23	to.
24	SPECIAL MASTER: Even if it's consented
25	to, it still has to be entered by a single Justice.

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 205 of 233 PageID: 48240

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 204
1	It's actually the only thing you do by
2	yourself when you're on the Supreme Court is emergent
3	applications. Everything else is done as a body.
4	And I would always give people the
5	opportunity to argue. Come to my chambers and we'll
6	talk. And I'd enter an order right after, so
7	which was generally drafted ahead of time. I can
8	say that now. I couldn't say that then.
9	MR. PLACITELLA: We figured that's what
10	was going to happen, so
11	SPECIAL MASTER: Well, you know, I was
12	then of the view and still remain of the view that if
13	really good lawyers say they need this quickly, then
14	they need it quickly. And you need to respond to it
15	quickly. Not an issue view shared by everyone. So
16	in any event
17	MR. ASSAF: I once had Bill McGuire,
18	who I was working with, and he
19	SPECIAL MASTER: Great guy.
20	MR. ASSAF: said the same thing to
21	me. We needed an emergent application from the
22	Appellate Division. And he said: I'm going to write
23	a letter and the Judge is going to call me. I said:
24	Really? He said: Yeah. And it's exactly what
25	happened.

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 206 of 233 PageID: 48241

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 205
1	SPECIAL MASTER: Huge loss to the
2	profession. What a great, great guy. Excellent
3	lawyer and just a wonderful human being. Big loss.
4	Anything else, counsel?
5	Well, thank you very much. I've kept
6	you way too long today. And that's partly my fault
7	for being too polite to you.
8	MR. ASSAF: We got a lot done.
9	SPECIAL MASTER: Especially to Mr.
10	Placitella, but that's okay.
11	(The matter concluded at 3:20 p.m.)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 207 of 233 PageID: 48242

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

	Page 206
1	CERTIFICATE OF OFFICER
2	
3	
4	I, ROBERT J. BOCCOLINI, a Certified Court
5	Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a
6	true and accurate transcript of the stenographic
7	notes taken by me at the time, place and on the date
8	hereinbefore set forth.
9	I do further certify that I am neither a
10	relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any
11	of the parties to this action, and that I am neither
12	a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel
13	and that I am not financially interested in this
14	action.
15	
16	
17	
18	Colity Borolini
19	ROBERT () BOCCOLINI, C.C.R. Certificate No. XI01040
20	Date: January 16, 2018
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

A					1.81
a.m. 11:12 AA 8 33:20 AB 50:23 198:25 abeyance 186:21 abiguit 25:13 136:21 abiguit 25:13 136:21 abiguit 276:20 abiguit 276:20 abiguit 276:20 abiguit 176:20		2 24::4 107-21	24.24 (0.2.9	142.16.142.22	42.4.47.11.66.10
ABA 33:20 ABA 50:23 198:25 ABA 50:23 198:25 abitity 25:13 136:21 abitity 25:14 abitity 25:13 136:21 abitity 25:14 abitity 25:14 abitity 25:13 136:21 abitity 25:14 abitity 25:14 abitity 25:13 136:21 abitity 25:14 abitity 26:14 abitity 26:14 abitity 25:14 abitity 26:14			0		
ABA 50:23 198:25 abeyance 186:21 abeyance 186:21 abeyance 186:21 abeyance 186:21 abeyance 186:21 abeyance 186:21 acdd 48:18 169:8 add 48:18 169:18 add 4					
abeyance 180:21 ability 25:13 136:21 ability 25:14 ability 25:13 136:21 ability 25:14			O		
ability 25:13 136:21 162:14 175:5 202:1 abject 176:20 abject 176:20 abile 11:25 12:14 27:16 32:24 72:24 110:15 118:12 27:16 32:24 72:24 110:15 118:12 119:23 120:4 121:9 124:7 address 28:18 43:10 66:1 72:21 80:6 146:20 148:15 152:20 171:24 156:21 188:6 152:20 171:24 156:21 188:6 152:20 171:24 156:21 188:6 152:20 171:24 156:21 188:6 152:20 171:24 156:21 188:6 152:20 171:24 156:21 188:6 152:20 171:24 156:21 188:6 152:20 171:24 156:21 188:6 152:20 171:24 156:21 188:6 152:20 171:24 156:21 188:6 152:20 171:24 156:21 188:6 152:20 171:24 156:21 188:6 152:20 171:24 156:21 188:6 161:2 62:15.8 absenti 14:16.20 15:13 19:20 15:				02.21	
162:14 175:5   202:1					
108.25   198.19,22   121:11   136:25   70:20 87:11 88:10   162:10   anymore 116:21   anym					
abject 176:20 able 1176:124 able 1125 12:14 able 1125 12:14 110:15 118:12 110:23 120:4 110:15 118:12 110:23 120:4 110:23 120:4 110:23 120:4 110:21 124:7 146:20 148:15 152:20 171:24 178:17,19 180:23 159:18 160:7 150:20 absent 14:16,20 151:31 19:20 absent 14:16,20 151:31 19:20 absent 14:16,20 151:31 19:20 absent 14:16:20 absent 14:16:20 151:31 19:20 absent 14:16:20 151:31 19:20 absent 14:16:20 absent 14:16:20 absent 14:16:20 151:31 19:20 absent 14:16:20 absent 14:16:20 absent 14:16:20 151:31 19:20 absent 14:16:20 absent 14:16:20 absent 14:16:20 absent 14:16:20 151:31 19:20 absent 14:16:20 absent 14:16:9:21 absent 14:16:9:21 absent 14:16:9:21 absent 14:16:9:21 absent 14:16:9:21 absent 14:16:09:21 absent 14:16:29 alleri 15:18 accupation for:13:18 accupation for:13:			•		
able 11:25 12:14 27:16 32:24 72:24 110:15 118:12 119:23 120:4 121:91 24:7 146:20 148:15 152:20 171:24 156:7 21:18 66:7 84:11,16 94:4 159:18 160:7 84:11,16 94:4 159:18 160:7 178:17.19 180:23 absent 14:16,20 15:13 19:20 15:13 19:20 15:13 19:20 15:13 19:20 2addressed 26:21 2bsentia 172:16 absonita 172:16 appear 182:1 appear 182:1 appear 182:1 appear 182:1 appear 182:1 appear 182:2 204:22 204:22 204:22 204:22 204:22 204:22 204:22 204:22 204:22 204:22 appear 182:20 17:41:10:10:10:10 appear 182:1 ample 10:3:17 ample 10:3:11 analogy 5:19 17:4:11 analogy 5:19 17:4:11 analogy 5:19 17:4:11 ana					
77:16 32:24 72:24 110:15 118:12 119:23 120:4 121:9 124:7 146:20 148:15 152:20 171:24 178:17,19 180:23 158:18 160:7 156:21 188:6 177:19 197:20 1513 19:20 1515 19:138:12 114:12 16:10:10,11 152:10 152:10 152:10 152:10 152:11 152:11 152:11 155:11 155:11 138 mmounts 67:9 95:11 114:12 16:10:10,1 18:54 18:54 18:52 199:15 18:54 18:54 18:54 177:11 14:12 13:16 114:12 16:10:10,1 18:54 17:19:19:10 114:12 16:10:10,1 18:54 17:19:19:10 114:12 16:10:10,1 18:54 17:19:19:13 114:12 16:12:16 114:12 16:12:16 152:11:15 155:11 14:12:16 152:11 155:11 14:12 16:12:16 152:11 14:12 10:10:10 11	<b>abject</b> 176:20				
10:15 118:12   10:6:7   address 28:18 43:10   66:17:2:18:6   10:2:0   10:2:0   amounts 67:9 95:11   118:12   10:10.14   185:4   ampulation 57:9 95:11   118:12   10:10.14   185:4   aprealm 22:9:12   ampulation 57:9 95:11   118:54   appear 83:5   appear					
19:23   120:4   66:1 72:21 80:6   83:2 89:13.14,23   mounts 67:9 95:11   185:2 186:17   180:23   156:2 158:6   179:21 80:6   179:20   66:1 70:21 80:6   179:20   17	27:16 32:24 72:24				1 0
121:9 124:7   146:20 148:15   156:21 158:6   156:21 159:18 160:7   159:18 160:7   171:19 197:20   absentia 172:16   absolutely 21:10   absolutely 21:10   abstract 58:25   abundance 189:25   accept 36:5   accept 36:5 10:22   administration   89:4   admissible 51:14   advance 48:5   advance	110:15 118:12		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
146:20   148:15   156:21   1	119:23 120:4				
152:20 171:24   178:17:19 180:23   absent 14:16.20   15:13 19:20   addressed 26:21   absent 14:16.20   15:13 19:20   addressed 26:21   69:9 80:5 82:17   absolutely 21:10   44:16 99:21   134:24 138:2   addresses 6:23   administration al 1:3.6   aligned 15:29   administration al 1:3.6   aligned 15:29   admissibility 120:18   advanced 36:25   advanced 36	121:9 124:7				
178:17,19 180:23   absent 14:16,20   absentia 172:16   absolutely 21:10   44:16 99:21   134:24 138:2   accepta 18:19   192:17   abstract 58:25   absundance 189:25   accepta 36:5   acceptable 72:15   105:23   accepted 34:25 50:5   access 11:24 12:16   12:20 13:12 170:9   170:10,11   accommodating 90:2 100:1   accomplished 36:3   accounts 18:15   advanced 36:25   12:115 206:6   accurately 105:19   121:14   accurately 105:19   123:15   acknowledging 69:14   accurately 105:20   122:10   activate 10:20   123:15   acknowledging 69:14   accurately 105:20   123:15   acknowledging 69:14   accurately 105:20   123:15   acknowledging 69:14   accurately 105:20   23:20 100:14   accurately 105:20   23:20 100:14   accurately 105:20   23:20 100:12   accurately 105:20   23:20 100:12   accurately 105:20   accurately 105:20   accurately 105:20   accurately 105:20   accurately 105:20   accurately 105:20   accurately 105:	146:20 148:15	· ·		-	
absent 14:16;20 15:13 19:20 addressed 26:21 absental 172:16 absental 172:16 absolutely 21:10 44:16:99:21 133:24 138:2 158:8,8 95:3 addresses 6:23 abead 4:21 27:22 abundance 189:25 accept 36:5 accept 36:5 acceptable 72:15 105:23 accepted 34:25 50:5 acceptable 72:15 accepted 34:25 50:5 accept 36:3 accepted 34:25 50:5 accept 36:3 accomplished 36:3 accourate 23:19,20 121:15 206:6 accurate 19:20 acknowledged 66:13 69:19 121:14 accused 119:20 acknowledged 66:13 69:19 121:14 accused 119:20 acknowledged 66:13 69:19 121:14 across-the-board 50:11 act 133:20 162:3 act 133:20 162:3 act 133:20 162:3 act 133:20 162:3 actinal 123:16 69:98 80:5 82:17 129:15 agreements 64:6 95:8 appead 4:21 27:22 ahead 4:21 27:22 ahish 18:12 application 92:25 apples 23:12,13 147:24 apples 23:12,13 147:24 apples 23:12,13 ap	152:20 171:24			2 0	
15:13 19:20   absentia 172:16   69:10 101:17   129:15   analogy 51:9   analysis 17:25 18:3   146:20 150:12   analogy 51:9   analysis 17:25 18:3   147:24   apples 23:12,13   analogy 51:9   analogy 51:	178:17,19 180:23			_	
absentia 172:16 absolutely 21:10 44:16 99:21 120:25 184:19 192:17 abstract 58:25 abundance 189:25 accept 36:5 accept 36:5 accept 36:5 accept 34:25 50:5 accept 34:25 50:5 accept 34:25 50:5 accest 11:24 12:16 12:20 13:12 170:9 170:10,11 accommodating 90:2 100:1 advances 68:6 advantage 96:23 alleged 10:1:2,13 advances 68:6 advantage 96:23 121:15 206:6 accurate 23:19,20 121:15 206:6 accurate 23:19,20 accomptished 36:3 accurate 23:19,20 121:15 206:6 accomptished 36:3 accounts 18:15 accurate 23:19,20 accomptished 36:3 accomp	absent 14:16,20				
absolutely 21:10 44:16 99:21 120:25 184:19 192:17 abstract 58:25 abundance 189:25 abundance 189:25 abundance 189:25 accepted 34:25 50:5 accepted 34:25 50:1 adwances 68:6 allegation 30:19 148:20 184:12,14 115:21 124:7,14 115:21 124:7,14 129ply 65:17 69:20 124:16:14 225:11 124:19 121:14 accupted 34:25 124:19 122:10 124:19 122:10 125:10 22:10 128:16 approach 14:16 approach 14:16 approach 14:16 approach 14:					
44:16 99:21 120:25 184:19 120:17 abstract 58:25 abundance 189:25 accept 36:5 acceptable 72:15 105:23 accepted 34:25 50:5 accepted 34:25 50:5 accepted 34:25 50:5 accepted 36:3 accepted 36:25 accepted 36:5 accepted 36:5 accepted 36:5 accepted 36:5 accepted 36:25 accepted 36:5 accepted 36:25 accepted 36:5 accepted 36:25 accepted 36:5 accepted 36:25 accepted 36:5 accepted 36:25 acc	absentia 172:16			<b>5</b>	
120:25 184:19   120:25 184:19   281:17   281:12 04:7   282:17   281:19 21:12   282:17   281:12 04:7   282:10 11:12   282:13   281:17   282:10 11:14   282:12   282:10 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:11   20:21   20:22   32:20 10:11   20:22   32:20 10:11   20:21   20:22   32:20 10:11   20:22   32:20 10:11   20:21   20:22   32:20 10:11   20:21   20:22   32:20 10:11   20:21   20:22   32:20 10:11   20:21   20:22   32:20 10:12   20:22   32:20 10:12   20:22   32:20 10:12   20:21   20:22   32:20 10:12   20:21   20:22   32:20 10:12   20:22   32:20 10:12   20:21   20:22   32:20 10:12   20:21   20:22   32:20 10:12   20:21   20:22   32:20 10:12   20:22   32:20 10:12   20:21   20:22   32:20 10:12   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:15   20:21   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:15   20:21   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:15   20:21   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:21   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:15   20:21   20:212   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:15   20:21   20:212   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:14   20:22   32:20 10:24   20:22   32:20 10:24   20:22   32:20 10:24   20:22   32:20 10:24   20:22   32:20 10:24   20:22   32:20 10:24   20:22   32:20 10:24   20:22   32:20 10:24   20:22   32:20 10:24   20:22   32:20 10:24   20:22   32:20 10:24   20:22   32:20 10:24   20:22   20:22   32:20 10:24   20:22   20:22   20:22   20:22   20:22   20:22   20:22   20:22   20:22   20:22   20:22   20:22   20:22   20:22	absolutely 21:10		agreements 64:6	•	
120:25 184:19   192:17   28:17   28:17   28:17   28:17   28:17   28:17   28:17   28:18   28:19   28:17   28:17   28:19   28:19   28:17   28:19   28:	·		,	, , , ,	
192:17   abstract 58:25   adequate 114:12   air 202:3   air 202:3   adequate 114:12   air 202:3   adequate 114:12   adequate 115:13   adequate 115:13   adequate 115:14   adequate 115:14   adequate 115:14   adequate 115:14   adequate 116:12   adequate 116:12   adequate 116:12   adequate 114:12   adequate 114:12   ad		addresses 6:23			
abstract 58:25 abundance 189:25 accept 36:5 accept 36:			41:1 204:7	84:21 98:5 167:14	174:21 183:10
abundance 189:25 accept 36:5 accept 36:5 accepted 37:15 105:23 accepted 34:25 50:5 accest 11:24 12:16 12:20 13:12 170:9 170:10,11 accommodating 90:2 100:1 accommodating 90:2 100:1 accommolished 36:3 accounts 18:15 accurate 23:19,20 121:15 206:6 accurately 105:19 121:14 accused 119:20 acknowledged 66:13 69:19 121:15 acknowledging 69:14 across-the-board 50:11 acti 133:20 162:3 acti 133:20 162:3 acti 133:20 162:3 acti 133:20 162:3 accospace 146:21 acti 133:20 162:3 accospace 146:21 acti 139:20 121:15 accused 10:20 32:20 10:11 acti 133:20 162:3 acti 133:20 162:3 acti 133:20 162:3 accospace 146:21 acti 139:20 123:15 206:11,14  accused 10:12 acti 133:20 162:3 acti 133:20 162:3 acti 133:20 162:3 acci 133:20 162:3 acci 133:20 162:3 acci 148:20 184:12 acci 133:20 162:3 acci 148:20 184:20 acci 148:20 184:21 acci 133:20 183:2 acci 148:20 184:20 acci 148:20 184:21 acci 148:20 184:12,14 acci 149:10 acci 148:20 184:20 acci 148:20 184:20 acci 148:20 184:21 acci 148:20 184:12,14 acci 148:20 184:20 acci 148:20 184:20 acci 148:20 184:21 acci 148:20 184:21 acci 148:20 184:21 acci 148:20 184:21 acci 148:20 184:12,14 ac		adequate 114:12	air 202:3	174:21	199:5 203:10,14
accept 36:5         Administration         al 1:3,6         announced 93:1,23         applications 164:4           305:23         admissibility 120:18         admissibility 120:18         admissibility 120:18         admissibility 120:18         announced 93:1,23         applications 164:4           accepted 34:25 50:5         accepted 34:25 50:5         admissible 51:14         56:11         32:9 35:16 43:24         109:23 110:20,24         57:24 60:14 66:16           12:20 13:12 170:9         admissions 155:17         admissions 155:17         139:21 167:12         110:24 111:4         126:11         126:11           accommodating 90:2 100:1         accomplished 36:3         37:17         allegations 34:23         124:19 127:16         159:5         159:5           accunate 23:19,20         37:17         allege 103:5 130:13         149:24 141:4,22         149:21 141:4,22         140:12 141:4,22         183:23         124:16 144:22         183:23         142:16 144:22         140:12 141:4,22         183:23         142:16 144:22         140:12 141:4,22         140:12 141:4,22         183:23         142:16 144:22         140:12 141:4,22         140:12 141:4,22         140:12 141:4,22         140:12 141:4,22         140:12 141:4,22         140:12 141:4,22         140:12 141:4,22         140:12 141:4,22         140:12 141:4,22         140:12 141:4,22         140:12 141:4,22		adequately 121:18	akin 18:12	anecdotal 34:15	203:20 204:21
acceptable 72:15         89:4 admissibility 120:18 admissibility 120:18 admissible 51:14 admissible 51:14         aligned 152:9 allegation 30:19 accepted 34:25 50:5 accepted 36:25		Administration	<b>al</b> 1:3,6	<b>announced</b> 93:1,23	applications 164:4
105:23   admissibility   120:18   adlegation 30:19   120:10   110:24   111:4   110:24   111:4   110:24   111:4   110:24   111:4   110:24   111:4   110:24   111:4   120:11   applies 55:10,22   57:24 60:14 66:16   120:11   120:11   110:24   111:4   110:24   111:4   110:24   111:4   120:11		89:4	aligned 152:9	answer 32:4 36:7	204:3
accepted 34:25 50:5 access 11:24 12:16         admissible 51:14 56:11         allegation 30:19 32:9 35:16 43:24 110:20,24 110:20,24 110:24 111:4         57:24 60:14 66:16 126:16 126:11           12:20 13:12 170:9 170:10,11 accommodating 90:2 100:1 accomplished 36:3 accounts 18:15 accurate 23:19,20 121:15 206:6 accurately 105:19 121:14 accused 119:20 acknowledged 66:13 69:19 147:15 acknowledging 69:14 across-the-board 50:11 act 133:20 162:3 action 1:2 20:22 32:20 101:14 act 133:20 162:3 action 1:2 20:22 32:20 101:14 109:19,20 123:15 206:11 and act 132:20 123:15 206:11 and act 133:20 162:3 aggregate 196:18 and action 1:2 20:22 32:20 101:14 aggregate 196:18 and accused 10:21 and act 133:20 162:3 aggregate 196:18 and accused 10:21 and act 133:20 162:3 aggregate 196:18 and accused 10:21 and act 133:20 162:3 aggregate 196:18 and accused 10:21 and accused 10:21 and accused 10:11 and accused 10:21 and accused 10:14 aggregate 196:18 and accused 10:21 and ac	_	admissibility 120:18	168:22	47:14 99:2 107:12	applies 55:10,22
access 11:24 12:16         56:11         32:9 35:16 43:24         110:24 111:4         12:21 124:7,14         12:21 124:7,14         12:21 124:7,14         12:21 124:7,14         12:21 124:7,14         12:21 124:7,14         12:21 124:7,14         12:21 124:7,14         12:21 124:7,14         12:21 124:7,14         12:21 124:7,14         12:21 124:7,14         12:21 124:7,14         12:21 124:7,14         12:21 124:7,14         12:21 124:7,14         12:31:9 137:2         appointed 115:18         13:9 137:2         appointed 115:18         18:3:23         appointing 169:3         appointing 1		admissible 51:14	allegation 30:19	109:23 110:20,24	57:24 60:14 66:16
12:20 13:12 170:9   170:10,11   admit 51:11   admit 51:11   advance 48:5   advanced 36:25   37:17   advances 68:6   accounts 18:15   advances 68:6   accurate 23:19,20   121:15 206:6   accurately 105:19   121:14   accused 119:20   acknowledged 66:13 69:19   147:15   acknowledging 69:14   across-the-board 50:11   act 133:20 162:3   action 1:2 20:22   20:011:14   109:19,20 123:15   20:6:11,14   action 1:2 20:22   32:20 101:14   109:19,20 123:15   20:6:11,14   admit 51:11   admit 51:11   admit 51:11   admit 51:11   admit 51:11   admit 51:11   allegat 103:23   12:1167:12   148:20 184:12,14   149:12 141:4,22   149:12   149:24 153:6   approinting 169:3   approint		56:11	32:9 35:16 43:24	110:24 111:4	126:11
170:10,11   accommodating   90:2 100:1   advanced 48:5   advanced 36:25   accounts 18:15   accounts 18:15   accurate 23:19,20   121:15 206:6   accurately 105:19   121:14   accused 119:20   acknowledged   66:13 69:19   147:15   acknowledging   69:14   across-the-board   50:14   accross-the-board   50:14   accross-the-board   50:14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   action 1:2 20:22   32:20 101:14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   206:10		admissions 155:17	139:21 167:12	115:21 124:7,14	apply 65:17 69:20
accommodating         advance 48:5         48:2 103:19         131:9 137:2         appointed 115:18           accomplished 36:3         37:17         allege 103:5 130:13         142:16 144:22         appointed 115:18           accounts 18:15         advances 68:6         allege 103:5 130:13         142:16 144:22         appointed 115:18           accurate 23:19,20         advantage 96:23         112:8 113:20,23         155:2 192:5,6         appreciate 10:21           accurately 105:19         153:2         advised 164:7         alleging 36:10,12         alleging 36:10,12         answer's 154:9         86:5 99:23 100:6           acknowledged         172:1,3 174:14         190:24 192:12         165:11,22 167:23         100:18 104:19         189:21,24           acknowledging         66:13 69:19         168:6 172:16         allows 13:12 40:7         100:18 104:19         189:21,24           across-the-board         192:20 193:2         alluding 149:25         131:0 135:12         approval 87:11           50:11         acrospace 146:21         affidavits 196:16         afternoon 5:5         alternate 84:17         155:13,14 158:18         arabesque 80:24           32:20 101:14         109:19,20 123:15         age 42:20 121:2         105:10 122:10         anticipate 196:1         areas 25:11 62:19           206:11,14		admit 51:11	allegations 34:23	124:19 127:16	159:5
90:2 100:1 accomplished 36:3 accounts 18:15 accurate 23:19,20 121:15 206:6 accurately 105:19 121:14 accused 119:20 acknowledged 66:13 69:19 147:15 acknowledging 69:14 across-the-board 50:11 act 133:20 162:3 action 1:2 20:22 32:20 101:14 109:19,20 123:15 206:11,14  accomplished 36:3 37:17 advances 68:6 advantage 96:23 advice 17:1 124:7 153:2 alleged 101:12,13 112:8 113:20,23 135:11 183:18 alleging 36:10,12 alligators 120:11 allow 42:5 72:2,4 allowed 156:7 allowed 156:17 allowed 156:		advance 48:5	48:2 103:19	131:9 137:2	appointed 115:18
accomplished 36:3 accounts 18:15 accourate 23:19,20 121:15 206:6 accurately 105:19 121:14 accused 119:20 acknowledged 66:13 69:19 147:15 acknowledging 69:14 across-the-board 50:11 act 133:20 162:3 action 1:2 20:22 32:20 101:14 109:19,20 123:15 206:11,14         37:17 advances 68:6 advantage 96:23 advantage 96:23 advantage 96:23 advice 17:1 124:7 advances 68:6 advantage 96:23 advice 17:1 124:7 advances 68:6 advantage 96:23 advice 17:1 124:7 advances 68:6 advantage 96:23 advice 17:1 124:7 advantage 96:23 advantage 96:23 alleged 101:12,13 155:2 192:5,6 answer's 154:9 answered 128:2 195:21 answered 128:2 195:21 answers 99:8 100:15 182:16 approach 141:16 approach 142:2 alligators 120:11 answering 173:4 answers 99:8 100:15 105:9,11 122:10 approach 141:16 approach 141:		advanced 36:25	148:20 184:12,14	140:12 141:4,22	
accounts 18:15         advances 68:6         advantage 96:23         alleged 101:12,13         149:24 153:6         appreciate 10:21           accurate 23:19,20         advantage 96:23         advice 17:1 124:7         128:11 183:18         128:15 206:6         answer's 154:9         accurately 105:19         42:24 48:6 64:22         86:5 99:23 100:6           accurately 105:19         advised 164:7         alleging 36:10,12         answered 128:2         18:24 149:10         18:24 149:10           accused 119:20         advocacy 171:22         allow 42:5 72:2,4         answering 173:4         approach 141:16         189:21,24           acknowledged         190:24 192:12         165:11,22 167:23         100:18 104:19         189:21,24           acknowledging         advocate 121:13         168:6 172:16         allude 149:14         128:2,14,15         approval 87:11           across-the-board         192:20 193:2         alluding 149:25         131:10 135:12         approval 87:11           act 133:20 162:3         action 1:2 20:22         affidavits 196:16         afternoon 5:5         alternate 84:17         155:13,14 158:18         arabesque 80:24           32:20 101:14         109:19,20 123:15         age 42:20 121:2         105:10 122:10         anticipate 196:1         arabesque 80:24           17:23,25         areas 25:11 62:19<		37:17	allege 103:5 130:13	142:16 144:22	appointing 169:3
accurate 23:19,20         advantage 96:23         112:8 113:20,23         155:2 192:5,6         42:24 48:6 64:22         42:24 48:6 64:22         86:5 99:23 100:6           accurately 105:19 12:14         advised 164:7         alleging 36:10,12         answer's 154:9         42:24 48:6 64:22         86:5 99:23 100:6         118:24 149:10         182:16         42:24 48:6 64:22         86:5 99:23 100:6         10:18:24 149:10         182:16         182:16         182:16         approach 141:16         189:21,24         appropriate 8:22         42:5         appropriate 8:22         42:5         approval 87:11	_	advances 68:6		149:24 153:6	
121:15 206:6   accurately 105:19   153:2   advised 164:7   accused 119:20   acknowledged   172:1,3 174:14   accused 119:20   acknowledged   190:24 192:12   190:24 192:12   196:12,15   advocate 121:13   action 1:2 20:22   32:20 101:14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   accused 121:13   206:11,14   accused 133:20 162:3   action 1:2 20:22   32:20 101:14   109:19,20 123:15   206:11,14   accused 164:7   adviced 17:1 124:7   135:11 183:18   alleging 36:10,12   allow 42:5 72:2,4   answering 173:4   answering 173:4   approach 141:16 189:21,24   approach 141:16 189:21,24   approval 87:11   approximately 8:9   105:15 155:13,14 158:18   arabesque 80:24   117:23,25   areas 25:11 62:19		advantage 96:23	0		
accurately 105:19 121:14 accused 119:20 acknowledged 66:13 69:19 147:15 acknowledging 69:14 across-the-board 50:11 act 133:20 162:3 action 1:2 20:22 32:20 101:14 109:19,20 123:15 206:11,14  accused 19:20 advocacy 171:22 alleging 36:10,12 alligators 120:11 allow 42:5 72:2,4 allow 42:5 72:2,4 allowed 156:7 165:11,22 167:23 173:20 165:11,22 167:23 173:20 100:18 104:19 105:9,11 122:10 182:16 approach 141:16 189:21,24 appropriate 8:22 42:5 approval 87:11 approved 51:5 approvimately 8:9 118:24 149:10 182:16 approach 141:16 189:21,24 appropriate 8:22 42:5 approval 87:11 approved 51:5 approximately 8:9 119:7 approval 87:11 approved 51:5 approximately 8:9 119:7 approvimately 8:9 119:20 193:15 approximately 8:9 119:7 approval 87:11 approved 51:5 approximately 8:9 119:7 approval 87:11 approved 51:5 approximately 8:9 118:24 149:10 182:16 approach 141:16 189:21,24 appropriate 8:22 42:5 approximately 8:9 119:7 approvimately 8:9 119:7 approval 87:11 approved 51:5 approximately 8:9 119:7 approval 87:11 approved 51:5 approximately 8:9 119:7 approval 87:11 approved 51:5 approximately 8:9 118:24 149:10 182:16 approach 141:16 189:21,24 appropriate 8:22 196:2,14 127:8,25 approximately 8:9 119:7 approved 51:5 approximately 8:9 118:24 149:10 182:16 approach 141:16 189:21,24 appropriate 8:22 128:2,14,15 128:2,14,15 128:2,14,15 128:2,14,15 128:2,14,15 128:2,14,15 128:2,14,15 128:2,14,15 128:2,14,15 128:2,14 189:10 182:16 approach 141:16 189:21,24 approval 87:11 approved 51:5 approximately 8:9 118:24 149:10 182:16 approach 141:16 189:21,24 appropriate 8:22 128:2,14,15 128:2,14 128:2,14,15 128:2,14,15 128:2,14,15 128:2,14,15 128:2,14,15 128:2,14,15					86:5 99:23 100:6
accused 119:20       advised 164:7       alligators 120:11       195:21       182:16         acknowledged       172:1,3 174:14       allow 42:5 72:2,4       answering 173:4       approach 141:16         66:13 69:19       190:24 192:12       165:11,22 167:23       100:18 104:19       189:21,24         147:15       196:12,15       173:20       105:9,11 122:10       appropriate 8:22         acknowledging       168:6 172:16       allows 13:12 40:7       126:2,14 127:8,25       approval 87:11         across-the-board       192:20 193:2       alluding 149:25       131:10 135:12       approval 87:11         50:11       aerospace 146:21       alter 10:2       144:21 148:14,23       119:7         act 133:20 162:3       aerospace 146:21       alternate 84:17       152:15 154:7       aptly 165:3         32:20 101:14       109:19,20 123:15       age 42:20 121:2       105:10 122:10       anticipate 196:1       areas 25:11 62:19         206:11,14       aggregate 196:18       128:15 130:13       anticipation 53:23       63:3,5 64:14,14					
accused 119:20         advocacy 171:22         allow 42:5 72:2,4         answering 173:4         approach 141:16           acknowledged         172:1,3 174:14         190:24 192:12         165:11,22 167:23         100:18 104:19         189:21,24           47:15         196:12,15         173:20         105:9,11 122:10         126:2,14 127:8,25         126:2,14 127:8,25         126:2,14 127:8,25         126:2,14 127:8,25         126:2,14,15         127:0         1	•				
acknowledged       172:1,3 174:14       allowed 156:7       answers 99:8 100:15       189:21,24         66:13 69:19       190:24 192:12       165:11,22 167:23       100:18 104:19       appropriate 8:22         147:15       196:12,15       173:20       105:9,11 122:10       42:5         acknowledging       69:14       168:6 172:16       allows 13:12 40:7       126:2,14 127:8,25       approval 87:11         across-the-board       192:20 193:2       allude 149:14       128:2,14,15       approved 51:5         3ct 133:20 162:3       acrospace 146:21       alter 10:2       144:21 148:14,23       119:7         action 1:2 20:22       affidavits 196:16       afternoon 5:5       age 42:20 121:2       105:10 122:10       155:13,14 158:18       arabesque 80:24         177:23, 56       173:20       173:20       173:20       173:20       173:20       128:25,14,15       128:25,14,15       128:25,14,15       131:10 135:12       119:7       119:7       119:7       119:7       119:7       119:7       119:7       119:7       119:7       119:7       119:7       119:7       119:7       119:7       117:23,25       117:23,25       117:23,25       116:11       117:23,25       119:10       117:23,25       119:10       117:23,25       119:10       119:10					
acknowledged       190:24 192:12       165:11,22 167:23       100:18 104:19       appropriate 8:22         147:15       advocate 121:13       168:6 172:16       168:6 172:16       126:2,14 127:8,25       approval 87:11         across-the-board       192:20 193:2       allude 149:14       128:2,14,15       approved 51:5         50:11       196:10       alluding 149:25       131:10 135:12       approval 87:11         act 133:20 162:3       acrospace 146:21       altern 10:2       144:21 148:14,23       119:7         action 1:2 20:22       affidavits 196:16       alternative 195:16       155:13,14 158:18       arabesque 80:24         32:20 101:14       age 42:20 121:2       105:10 122:10       anticipate 196:1       areas 25:11 62:19         206:11,14       aggregate 196:18       128:15 130:13       anticipation 53:23       63:3,5 64:14,14			,	U	
196:12,15 advocate 121:13 advocate 121:13 allows 13:12 40:7 allows 13:10 135:12 approval 87:11 approved 51:5 approximately 8:9 11:0 13:20 10:11 act 133:20 162:3 action 1:2 20:22 affidavits 196:16 afternoon 5:5 age 42:20 121:2 aggregate 196:18 128:15 130:13 anticipate 196:1 anticipation 53:23 63:3,5 64:14,14		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
acknowledging         advocate 121:13         allows 13:12 40:7         126:2,14 127:8,25         approval 87:11           69:14         168:6 172:16         allude 149:14         128:2,14,15         approval 87:11           across-the-board         192:20 193:2         alluding 149:25         131:10 135:12         approval 87:11           50:11         act 133:20 162:3         aerospace 146:21         alter 10:2         144:21 148:14,23         119:7           action 1:2 20:22         affidavits 196:16         alternative 195:16         155:13,14 158:18         arabesque 80:24           32:20 101:14         age 42:20 121:2         105:10 122:10         anticipate 196:1         areas 25:11 62:19           206:11,14         aggregat 196:18         128:15 130:13         anticipation 53:23         63:3,5 64:14,14			· ·		
69:14		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
303.14       across-the-board       192:20 193:2       alluding 149:25       131:10 135:12       approximately 8:9         50:11       act 133:20 162:3       aerospace 146:21       alter 10:2       144:21 148:14,23       119:7         action 1:2 20:22       affidavits 196:16       alternative 195:16       155:13,14 158:18       arabesque 80:24         32:20 101:14       age 42:20 121:2       age 42:20 121:2       amended 101:1       159:16       anticipate 196:1       117:23,25         areas 25:11 62:19       action 1:2 20:22       areas 25:11 62:19       areas 25:11 62:19					
50:11 act 133:20 162:3 action 1:2 20:22 32:20 101:14 109:19,20 123:15 206:11,14  196:10 aerospace 146:21 affidavits 196:16 afternoon 5:5 age 42:20 121:2 206:11,14  196:10 alter 10:2 alter 10:2 alter 10:2 alternate 84:17 alternative 195:16 amended 101:1 105:10 122:10 anticipate 196:1 anticipation 53:23 areas 25:11 62:19					
act 133:20 162:3 action 1:2 20:22 affidavits 196:16 afternoon 5:5 age 42:20 121:2 aggregate 196:18 206:11,14 act 133:20 162:3 arabesque 80:24 and 101:1 anticipate 196:1 arabesque 80:24 arabe					
action 1:2 20:22       affidavits 196:16       alternative 195:16       155:13,14 158:18       arabesque 80:24         32:20 101:14       age 42:20 121:2       age 42:20 121:2       anticipate 196:1       arabesque 80:24         206:11,14       aggregate 196:18       128:15 130:13       anticipation 53:23       arabesque 80:24         117:23,25       areas 25:11 62:19         asignegate 196:18       128:15 130:13       anticipation 53:23       63:3,5 64:14,14					
action 1.2 20.22 32:20 101:14 109:19,20 123:15 206:11,14  age 42:20 121:2 aggregate 196:18 117:23,25 areas 25:11 62:19 128:15 130:13 anticipate 196:1 anticipation 53:23 63:3,5 64:14,14					
109:19,20 123:15 206:11,14 age 42:20 121:2 105:10 122:10 anticipate 196:1 areas 25:11 62:19 128:15 130:13 anticipation 53:23 63:3,5 64:14,14				· ·	
206:11,14 aggregate 196:18 128:15 130:13 anticipation 53:23 63:3,5 64:14,14					
200.11,17	The state of the s	C			
active 128:9   aggint tot 201.7   140.5 141.5   anybody 54.14 45.5   04.14,20 00.0	T				
	active 128:9	"SSIL 104 201.1	1 10.5 171.5	anjoodj 57.17 75.5	01.17,20 00.0
		1	1	1	I

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 209 of 233 PageID: 48244

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

				Page 208
	I	I	I	
arguably 16:23	114:23 115:1	assured 198:22	132:2 138:22	124:9 152:19
<b>argue</b> 28:3,8 40:10	129:10 137:16,20	attached 171:22	141:15 152:20	160:5 163:18
181:11 187:5	138:14,17 141:9	172:3 174:14	153:12 157:5	165:16,24 185:10
204:5	141:12,20,23	attack 74:5,9 116:4	158:19 159:9	195:10 199:14,25
argued 37:16 38:23	142:12 151:9	attacking 116:2	167:24 169:2	<b>BASF's</b> 18:15,19
60:4 65:7 73:4	152:4 154:22	attacks 157:18	179:11 185:16	98:5,9,14 104:13
<b>arguing</b> 36:2,4	156:16,25 163:15	attorney 6:13 8:7	188:16	112:4 158:17
116:9	163:22 164:6	10:5 32:5 58:2	backfill 185:11	165:12,21 166:5
argument 1:11 29:8	168:4,17,22 169:5	65:4,10,18 66:6	background 112:1	basic 90:8,9,10,11
39:2,11 46:10	169:12 171:10,15	87:21,23 88:1	backwards 13:18	90:11 96:2 104:8
56:6 61:19 67:22	172:25 174:5	91:10,16 142:8	bad 43:12 65:1	104:10 155:8
68:5,7,12 69:20	175:4,10,25	156:19 206:10,12	136:5 137:2	basically 8:17,21
112:21 192:17	176:10,14,24	attorney's 51:11	157:12 162:21	101:25 103:2
arguments 8:21	177:10,15,20	57:19 148:2	bag 167:18 195:19	116:1 168:9
45:19 60:16 96:5	179:10,23 180:1,5	attorney/client 6:2	<b>bah</b> 153:16,16,16,16	basis 15:1 17:17
140:1 187:25	180:10 181:6	11:14 54:16 56:22	153:16	31:12 57:5 64:24
arises 40:6	182:4,20 183:25	135:6 137:14	<b>ball</b> 111:1 157:8	65:16 66:5,5 67:7
arm 90:2	185:3 186:14	141:25 142:3	<b>Ballard</b> 1:11,14	69:18 70:18
Army 90:22	187:2,6,13 188:10	148:18 163:21	<b>ballet</b> 80:23 117:22	101:20 107:17
arranged 53:23	188:19,22 189:1	166:11 175:17	<b>ballpark</b> 41:21 72:9	109:15 112:20
58:4	189:12,15 190:18	199:1,3	bankruptcy 66:11	114:8 134:22
arrived 166:3	190:21 191:13,20	attorneys 2:6,10,13	66:14,20,25 67:8	142:2 164:9
<b>Arthur</b> 3:11 4:24	191:23 192:4,9,11	2:17,22 3:4,8,11	67:20	165:24
articulate 121:17	192:23 193:5,6,9	10:20 11:8 53:23	bar 30:25 32:21	bear 16:1
articulated 121:19	193:14,17,22	144:1 146:18	167:1	beard 27:19 38:8
asbestos 6:15 11:10	194:17,21 195:4	attorneys' 65:24	barn 166:13,13	118:4 157:14,15
34:19 47:7 50:5	195:23 196:1,4,8	91:22	barred 7:7 8:14	beef 141:17
85:6 91:12 92:3,8	196:14,20,25	audited 50:5	base 19:14 60:21	began 89:1
96:25 97:8 98:6	197:6,9 198:11,17	August 100:16	90:12,14,14,14,16	beginning 42:21
98:10,12,16,17,22	199:10 200:2	authenticity 116:2,5	90:18	begins 143:17
132:8 147:2	203:13,17 204:17	117:7	based 7:12 34:10	behalf 4:6,7,9,11,17
asbestosis 86:20	204:20 205:8	authority 17:19	73:2 98:21 112:21	4:18 53:12 57:10
aside 40:21 74:5	Assaf's 41:13	53:6,7 54:8	123:15,23 127:4	108:3 164:2
asked 11:20 43:7	163:13	avail 15:4	139:2 148:20	182:13 195:10
53:7 69:7 82:6	assert 7:13 91:5	available 30:3 45:1	155:5 171:12	behaved 32:17
124:13 134:25	asserted 20:23	86:18,22	bases 57:4	behavior 30:24 40:6
164:3	92:19	availed 14:23	BASF 1:6 2:10,22	beings 56:8
asking 6:10 16:7	assertions 163:21	Avenue 2:12,15	2:25 3:4 4:12,13	belief 15:20,20
58:24 61:13 125:7	asserts 6:18 166:19	avoid 74:8 149:12	5:2,9,14,18,24 6:4	131:4,24 134:20
125:8 178:14	assigned 183:22	awake 108:10	6:7,10,18,21 7:13	135:13,23 146:4
	assist 31:2			· ·
asks 12:15 139:18	Associates 2:17	aware 146:22	8:17,19 9:15,23	146:17 148:1 151:24 152:5,8
145:11,20		199:22	12:15 18:12 19:15	,
<b>aspersion</b> 35:22	Association 31:1	awful 116:10 136:24	19:18,22,25 20:1	154:2,16,20,21
Assaf 2:9 4:13,13	32:22	B	20:4 29:9 33:12	155:5
23:6 35:18 47:20	assume 11:17 34:5		33:17 34:6,25	believe 15:24 16:14
48:8 49:6 50:17	66:1 83:14 87:14	<b>B</b> 3:7 98:14 109:13	39:16 43:16 44:9	22:24 25:4 44:10
50:25 59:16 62:13	87:19,25 88:4,24	148:13 152:23	45:21,24 51:18	44:12 45:11 47:15
62:22 63:16,18,21	89:1 105:24 106:6	155:6	53:13 67:23 68:2	50:18 52:5 54:4
74:5,7,10,21	109:4 136:14,23	back 35:1 43:2	69:2 93:8 98:8,18	57:23 58:14 68:13
75:15,18,20 76:4	158:2 171:16	44:10,20 45:13	99:8 100:14	82:21 87:8,22
76:12,19,24 77:2	176:22	59:1 60:24 74:1	101:11,18,25	91:18,19 96:13
77:6,24 78:8,19	assumed 18:10,23	74:17 77:19 81:3	102:10 104:4,18	108:22 115:2
79:3 80:18 81:9	assumes 7:16	101:5 105:20	109:11 112:8,11	120:9 161:9
81:15 82:7 84:22	assuming 89:18	114:14 121:24	115:5,8 119:6	172:10
95:6,24 106:4	174:25	125:14 128:17,21	120:1 123:15,21	believer 155:15
	l	l	l	

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 210 of 233 PageID: 48245

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

				Page 209
	1	1	1	I
belongs 35:25	<b>Bill</b> 204:17	198:5 199:15	call 80:23 161:3	110:21 112:8
bench 202:25	<b>binder</b> 162:13	201:3,13,15	168:14 197:16,16	115:10,14,16
benefit 119:4	<b>Bingo</b> 133:12	<b>briefed</b> 73:4 176:23	198:7 201:18	117:3 125:1
best 59:17 74:3	<b>bit</b> 4:21 5:22 6:3 9:1	<b>briefing</b> 53:11 93:23	204:23	130:25 131:7,12
102:4 111:14	14:6 16:3 35:3	194:1 196:21,24	called 6:5,8 30:24	131:18 134:8,16
115:24 118:24	42:22 47:5 56:6	202:10	58:5 77:1 150:10	134:21 135:9,10
123:19 124:11	79:14 117:25	<b>briefly</b> 106:20 112:4	168:14 197:8,12	139:21 140:20,25
125:8,20 126:15	132:3 133:22	<b>briefs</b> 185:11 197:8	<b>calling</b> 30:20 141:18	143:21 146:19
127:16 130:5,8	140:24 147:23	197:12,16 198:3,5	calls 107:3 115:10	147:3,9 149:15,17
153:10,11,25	166:14 182:15	201:1	<b>camera</b> 164:10	154:5 157:25
158:1,24 174:2	202:18	<b>bring</b> 185:15	168:23,25 170:23	158:13 165:19
188:9 201:19	bizarre 170:4	<b>brings</b> 60:24	183:1 192:18,21	169:25 170:10,11
<b>better</b> 59:3,10,16	<b>blame</b> 43:3,4,5	<b>broad</b> 97:15,17	192:22 193:2	170:18 171:3
60:1	188:25	191:9	195:9	172:6,21 173:12
<b>Bevan</b> 2:17,17 4:19	<b>blaming</b> 156:10	broadly 12:13	camp 188:21	173:18 174:2
6:6,8,13,16,19 7:5	<b>blue</b> 81:6 112:15	<b>brook</b> 73:2	<b>cancer</b> 70:12	175:13 176:5
7:11,19,19,20 8:1	119:15 142:23	brought 41:1	candid 186:9	177:3,8,25 178:2
8:12,20 9:4,22	146:15	119:16 176:12,15	candidly 125:10	178:3,8,22 180:4
11:8,9 13:12	boatload 191:1	180:22	185:13,19 195:9	182:4 183:15,21
15:18,20,25 16:20	<b>Boccolini</b> 1:12 27:8	bubbling 184:22	200:7	183:23 184:12,17
17:13 18:4 19:10	206:4,18	<b>bunch</b> 88:13	capable 156:19	184:21 185:13,18
19:15,21 20:4,8	<b>body</b> 204:3	<b>burden</b> 9:15,16 22:4	<b>capital</b> 59:11 109:10	185:22 186:3,7,16
20:11,13,14,20	<b>bona</b> 126:1	64:25 69:17,19	carcass 48:17 79:5	186:22,25 187:11
22:2 28:12 31:7	bookmark 200:13	73:18 74:1 77:17	care 155:7 168:18	188:13 194:2
31:18,24 32:1,3	201:3,12	burdens 7:12	172:15 174:13	197:23,24
32:10 35:14,16,22	bookmarks 200:7	<b>bus</b> 108:6	careful 173:21	cases 11:10 21:20
46:7 49:13,22	bottom 32:8	business 8:4 30:15	carrying 78:1	26:15 30:20,23
50:8,9 53:7,19	Boulevard 3:10	37:13,23 38:10	case 6:19 10:6,8	31:14,24,25 32:1
54:9 61:6,16,23	<b>bound</b> 56:2 136:12	112:10,25	11:6 13:11 14:19	32:3,9,17 33:8,15
61:24 64:23 67:16	<b>Boyle</b> 3:9,11 4:23,23		14:24,25 15:19	33:16,18,21 34:19
70:1 74:14,14,22	4:25 5:1	C	16:20 17:22 18:1	35:8 39:11,20,21
74:23,25 82:22	<b>brain</b> 174:15	C 109:14 148:13	18:5 19:6 20:5,7	40:13,19 41:6
91:10,13 92:1,11	brakes 77:4	152:23 155:6	20:15,22 21:17,18	44:5 49:7,8,12
96:15 97:1 99:11	Branch 90:5	C-1 1:23	21:21 23:24 24:2	50:15 51:5,6 58:3
131:6 132:13	break 79:2 81:2,22	C.C.R 206:18	25:25 29:10,11	69:3,6 70:21
137:5,10 139:3	156:5 188:14	C4 15:1	30:14 31:22 32:22	80:16 93:18
140:13 141:6	189:17,18 192:8	Cahill 2:13 3:8 4:14	33:11,21,24 34:22	101:22 114:10
142:14,16 146:20	<b>Brendan</b> 2:16 4:18	4:17 5:24 13:8	34:22 35:9,13	117:17 121:3
149:14 150:3,13	Bress 3:4 5:2,2	19:2,25 22:6,12	37:8,11,19,21	130:16 135:20
151:4,11,13,18	<b>bridge</b> 93:25 175:9	22:25 23:1,6,20	38:5,20,23,24	140:24 153:3
152:1,7,12,16,22	brief 15:6 21:20	23:22 24:11 25:21	39:4,14,15 42:3	191:3 192:24
152:23,24 153:2,7	45:4 59:22 64:7,8	29:4 53:5,9,12	42:16,19 43:14,15	193:12
153:16 157:1	64:13 70:2 112:2	54:10,20 61:2	43:25 44:8,21	<b>cashed</b> 81:13
Bevan's 14:18 19:3	160:8 163:24	80:13,14 164:2	45:6,14 48:2,24	Cassandra 3:7 4:16
50:15 65:10 137:7	164:14,15,24	166:4 182:13,18	49:22 50:4,8,8,9	cat 167:18 195:18
137:12 151:7	165:2,25 169:25	183:2 185:10	50:21 51:10,14	Catalysts 1:6 2:10
152:19 156:18	170:1 175:12	195:10	52:18,19 53:21	2:22,25 3:4
<b>beyond</b> 45:17 103:16 134:17	177:24,24 181:14	Cahill's 18:20	54:14 57:21 58:2	categories 9:24
	181:25 185:4	calculating 101:19	65:23 66:17 68:10	11:18 25:4 54:7
135:5 175:15	186:15,20 187:5	101:20 109:13,15	71:19 73:1,12,14	58:12 61:19,22 62:1 66:8 79:24
big 141:16 155:15	187:17 188:1,13	calculation 128:23 calendars 203:2	73:15,16 74:15,22 74:25 75:2 76:7	62:1 66:8 79:24 79:25 81:12,24
163:7,16 180:17	189:3 191:5,8,12 192:15,25 194:23	caliber 125:13	76:20 77:1,21,25	82:4 91:8 106:19
198:20,20 199:8 205:3	195:25 196:11,18	California 93:2	89:24 93:20,22	categorized 20:17
biggest 179:10	195:25 196:11,18	191:3	94:8 107:6,16	categorized 20:17 category 10:9,13
Diggest 1/9.10	171.4,3,12,14	171.3	74.0 107.0,10	category 10.9,13
	I	I	I	I

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 211 of 233 PageID: 48246

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

				Page 210
	l	l	1	l
11:19 54:3 57:17	105:9 116:6 157:9	31:3 85:10,12,13	156:18 176:17	<b>comfort</b> 169:16
67:12 92:1 102:5	181:20	88:1 98:8,14,18	187:14 191:8,16	comfortable 42:2
115:4 137:4	changes 128:8	98:20 107:18	196:9,14	155:7
causation 33:24	194:24	132:7 133:17	clearly 45:17 142:16	coming 40:8 99:23
71:20 135:9	changing 39:24	134:1 145:16	195:19	179:11
cause 20:22 84:16	128:9	147:7	clerk 202:22 203:2	commencement
135:10,11	characteristics	claimant 84:4	clerk's 200:18,18,22	98:6
caution 189:25	169:5	claimed 21:11	202:20,23	commencing 1:12
Center 2:21	characterization	109:18 119:13	client 17:24 20:9	160:13
central 80:24	25:17 121:15	claiming 86:19	48:18 49:13,16	comment 95:7
142:13 150:12	charging 176:18	135:6	57:8 65:6 89:11	130:20
cert 41:11 70:24	charter 42:16	claims 10:7 51:12	96:25 131:23	comments 59:15
73:19 77:10 106:3	chase 93:11	53:14 66:10 70:14	150:14 152:22	104:18 127:20
122:1,8 159:24	Chatham 3:10	71:7,21 75:25	154:11 181:17	Commerce 2:3
186:4	cheap 33:18	85:1 86:11 97:12	client's 57:21 79:5	<b>common</b> 197:10
certain 62:1 82:14	check 81:12,13,13	104:2 105:8 138:4	155:14	communicate
111:5 148:24	88:10,10,20,22	140:21 145:12,21	clients 10:22,23,25	136:21
166:20 171:5	158:23	145:23	12:11,12,21 14:18	communicating
198:5	checked 18:2	clarity 95:18	20:14 22:23 54:12	137:11
certainly 14:16	Chernick 131:19	Clark 52:9	61:24,24 65:8,11	communications
30:25 31:20 32:21	Cherry 1:16	class 7:17,22 8:6	96:16,20 117:17	67:1 144:1 147:9
35:19,20 45:2	chest 85:5	12:12,25 13:1	119:19 153:14,17	191:10
50:18 65:10,13	Chief 55:18 60:7	14:9,10,16,17,19	156:21 158:2	comp 85:13
121:9	78:2 100:17	14:20,22 15:2,9	185:3 195:13	companies 69:3
Certificate 206:1,19 certification 7:23	120:19 137:20,21	15:10,11,13,13,15	clients' 15:22 20:11	comparison 13:7
14:21 15:6 25:14	139:24 142:14 144:3 169:2	19:3 25:14 39:5	36:2 150:20	compel 6:5,8 99:8 158:18
41:19 73:17 76:14	child 131:12 132:11	41:11,17,19,20,21 44:3 52:8 55:16	clip 162:13 clips 162:15	compelled 13:21
76:18 101:15	Chinese 168:14	61:5 70:11,13,24	close 24:8	17:2,18,23 30:15
102:6,9,12 103:15	CHK 88:19,21	70:25 71:7,15	co-counsel 181:16	compensation 6:16
103:19,25 110:22	chose 45:5	72:3 73:17,19	co-defendant 21:22	67:16 70:20 91:12
125:1	chose 45.5 chosen 57:18	74:13 77:9,10	co-defendants 68:25	92:12 98:8,14,18
certifications	Chris 29:18 199:18	82:13 84:12 89:23	codified 115:24	competence 136:18
196:19	Christopher 2:4 4:5	96:12,25 97:2	cogency 48:6	136:18
certified 1:12,22	chunk 69:20	98:19,23 99:1	COHEN 2:2 43:20	<b>competent</b> 136:19
15:1,1 76:7	churning 95:22	101:14,15 102:5,8	118:16 161:8	136:22
107:16 124:21	cigarettes 88:25	102:9,12 103:18	163:1,4 197:15	compilation 196:12
206:4	circuit 33:22 40:11	103:20,24 106:3	collected 29:9	compiled 53:23
certify 206:5,9	44:22 45:8,18	106:11,24 107:2	color 128:4	complaint 12:13
chain 40:15	57:22 73:20 77:5	107:16,21 108:13	colorful 165:4	24:6 36:7 49:17
<b>challenge</b> 33:19,20	175:14 176:16,16	108:21 110:13,16	columns 51:23	73:23 81:12 97:15
33:23 43:13 44:11	176:17 179:12,13	110:21 122:1,8	come 29:21 34:14	109:18 130:14
122:25 175:16	181:13,19 182:22	124:21 125:1	38:17 39:16 45:15	136:4,9,23 140:6
challenged 33:16	185:8 188:8,10	138:3,13,13,14,22	65:10 74:17 76:20	141:5 143:23
34:2	191:2 192:15	138:25 139:7	77:19 81:3 94:6	148:21
challenging 172:15	circumstance 43:12	159:24 186:4	101:5 106:12	complaints 102:2
175:16	circumstances	clear 19:5 23:16,18	116:15 121:24	<b>complete</b> 20:8 149:3
chambers 204:5	125:20 167:15	42:16 54:19 70:7	126:6 130:4	202:1
<b>chance</b> 126:24	170:4,15 184:18	89:14 94:17 96:12	136:13 140:3	completed 49:14
132:12 172:16	citation 196:22	96:18 117:13	153:19 157:5	203:1
193:1 194:23	cite 193:13	120:17 125:4	166:9 181:10	completely 136:25
<b>change</b> 64:7 105:4	cited 66:15,16 137:5	130:11 131:15	203:9 204:5	177:20
139:22,22 145:13	city 90:10	132:14 145:3	comes 61:12 65:8	complicated 167:21
158:3 181:25	CIVIL 1:2	150:3 151:5	143:23 181:12	comply 22:3
<b>changed</b> 10:2 82:2	claim 8:23 24:14	152:18 153:19	203:10	complying 73:3
L				

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 212 of 233 PageID: 48247

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

				1 agc 211
comprehensive 25:5	203:22,24	corners 142:8 189:9	27:10 40:11 42:25	<b>custody</b> 136:10
comprehensive 23.5	consents 100:21	192:2	44:11,19,20 45:13	140:9 149:23
comprised 18.2 compromise 19:18	consider 165:7	Corning 46:13	45:14,20 54:1,5	150:5
19:21 94:6,16,23	193:25	corollary 139:10	55:8,12 60:10,13	custom 49:11
computer 75:13	consideration	corporate 1:15	60:18 61:6 66:21	custom 49:11 cut 20:24
concealment 43:15	166:15	25:24 29:5 115:8		CUY 87:4
concern 40:4 71:24	considerations		70:3,17 92:20	
		correct 9:5,9 11:19	111:1 143:4 164:19 165:17	Cuyahoga 87:6
141:20,23 148:4	167:14 184:2,4 consistent 121:19	11:21 12:6,7 21:10 22:22 24:15	168:24 173:17	D
173:3 174:8 183:1 189:25	consistent 121:19 consonant 121:19	24:16 28:13 35:18	175:15,21,21	<b>d</b> 55:5 109:16
concerned 35:25	consulting 57:8	43:18,19,20 49:2	179:2,6 190:17	152:23
65:21 76:6 133:19	consumer 198:4	49:6 52:10 56:16	197:19 202:8,19	<b>D.C</b> 2:8 3:3
202:5	contact 84:17	57:3,16 58:10	202:20 203:2,2	damage 15:2 109:14
concerning 5:23,25	contain 6:11 92:17	68:3 69:4 75:15	202:20 203:2,2	109:15,16 111:7
14:16 15:18 46:8	98:10,16 147:2	75:18 76:24 77:2	court's 10:14 15:17	damages 71:19
91:16 99:6 104:13	contained 13:6	77:6 78:19 80:10	107:12 165:8	98:20 101:12,17
	24:25 57:25 98:11			101:19,19,20,21
105:11 112:10	98:17	81:24 106:4 109:5	<b>courtroom</b> 121:4,7 <b>courts</b> 30:25 32:21	101:19,19,20,21
concerns 9:20 58:20 58:21 66:2 91:21	98:17 containing 8:8	113:23 128:24 139:6 144:2		101:21 103:11 104:8 106:22,25
91:24	10:21 58:6	139:6 144:2	50:20 126:22,22 185:20	104:8 106:22,25
conclude 178:3	contains 11:14,24	176:24 177:15	cover 193:12,12	107.4,8,13,18
concluded 205:11	12:10 13:15 23:22		199:4,5	128:23
		180:10 182:21 183:25 191:20,23	covered 10:1	Dan 5:2
<b>conclusion</b> 36:6 128:7	53:20,25 54:13 151:3	192:9 195:17		dance 80:24 190:16
condition 86:20		196:4,8	cranky 78:3,5 114:17,20,23,23	danger 37:8
conduct 72:13	contemporaneous 102:11 159:23	correctly 52:12	114:17,20,23,23	DANIEL 3:4
confer 9:13 13:7	contend 109:11	64:24 106:18	crazed 116:24 127:6	data 8:9 29:8 95:22
51:21 95:10,12	content 103.11 context 31:24 32:1,3	correspondence	169:14	193:18
96:9	38:21 173:11	113:14 135:15	crazy 47:11	database 6:6,9,11
conference 82:8	continue 63:20	145:25 150:16	create 131:9 202:22	6:21 7:5 8:7,8,19
202:15 203:3	continue 03.20 continued 2:1 3:1	corresponds 145:6	created 29:14 112:7	8:20 9:12 10:18
conferred 66:12	140:5	counsel 2:24 4:3	112:7	10:21 11:12,17,22
confers 82:10	continues 63:25	5:14,18 14:9 20:3	creation 56:13	11:24 12:9,16
confident 42:8	contours 72:9	28:25 41:18 44:4	credibility 51:15	13:6,8,13,15
72:11	197:24	56:1 70:23 71:3	credible 34:12	16:23,25 17:10,24
confidential 15:8	control 124:2	72:2,19 89:23	crime 6:1 163:20	18:1,9,12,19,19
37:25 38:1 46:2,4	136:10 140:9	130:22 131:1,6	165:9,18 167:13	19:2 20:4,16,18
46:6,9,24,25 47:3	149:23 150:5	132:13 135:15	169:25 170:19	22:6,12,25 23:2,7
47:8,9,20,22	161:19 176:16	140:7,19 145:25	171:4 174:21	23:20,22 24:12,20
65:12,24 66:14,19	controversy 5:23	151:15,16,21	175:6,17 176:6	25:21 27:2,5,6,6,7
66:21 67:1 91:19	conversation 56:21	157:18 160:4	187:22 194:3,5	28:4,12,25 29:14
92:5	123:1,2 200:4	167:23 183:2	critical 26:12	47:11 51:22 53:5
confidentiality 8:4	conversations 144:6	205:4 206:10,12	cross-examination	53:7,9,17,19 54:9
46:15 60:9 65:19	copies 112:14 113:1	counsel's 124:6	159:5	54:10,11,12,20
65:25 67:5,10	113:6,19 114:11	country 93:16	crucial 54:14 57:20	56:25 57:2,19,24
68:1 69:8,11,16	116:17,21 117:3,8	126:23	crux 106:15 139:21	58:13 59:2 61:16
91:23 92:10 95:3	119:10,10,13,16	<b>County</b> 87:6	CTY 87:4	61:23 62:20 67:18
confirm 81:23	173:9,14	couple 82:1 170:21	cure 153:23	70:2 74:15 75:4,9
conflicts 167:22	copy 12:15 13:5,8	187:13 189:17	cured 183:11	75:10 79:21 80:14
confusion 145:7	13:11 52:2 112:16	Courier 163:8	cures 8:23	80:14 82:12,22
connected 92:19	114:6 116:2,2,5	course 89:19 99:16	curing 9:19	91:21 94:18 96:11
CONNELL 2:11	120:22,23,25	99:17 146:12	current 12:11,13	96:16
<b>Connolly</b> 3:6 4:17	164:24	150:8	34:6 103:7	databases 6:20 11:4
<b>consent</b> 102:21	Coren 2:5 4:7,7	court 1:1,12,22 10:1	currently 97:3	11:25 29:4,12
consented 203:15	108:4,6	15:24 18:5 22:5	145:3	56:7 58:5 61:2,12
				<u> </u>

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 213 of 233 PageID: 48248

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

The content of the					Page 212
date 1:12 20:21         57:20 87:14 94:1         19:8 12:15         decermined 137:17         discremines 164:20         167:1         discourse 107:8         discourse 107:2         discourse 107:8         discourse 107:1         discourse 107:1         discourse 107:1         discourse 107:1         discourse 107:1 <td></td> <td>I</td> <td>I</td> <td>I</td> <td>I</td>		I	I	I	I
881:12 85:12.14.14   100:17 105:5   113:2.3   113:2.1   13:1.1   13:1.1   16:1.3					
1875,6 90.6.8   1257 13015.24   131:17 134:22   206:7,19   139:19 142:18   143:21 153:13   143:21 153:13   143:21 153:13   143:21 153:13   143:21 153:13   145:12,10   166:1   201:7   201:7   201:11					
106.7 202:15   131:17 134:22   demonstrate 38:24   develope 140:20   develope 140:					
206.7.19	87:5,6 90:6,8	· ·			
date   106:13   143:21   153:13   denon   157:24   develop   140:20   discoverability   denostrates   39:10   develop   140:20   descoverability   denostrates   39:10   develop   140:20   descoverability   denostrates   39:10   develop   140:20   descoverability   develope   160:17   develop   160:17   develop   160:17   develop   160:17   develop   160:17   descoverability   descoverability   develop   160:17   develop   160:17   descoverability   develop   160:17   descoverability   develop   160:17   develop   160:17   descoverability   descoverability   descoverability   descoverability   develop   160:17   descoverability   d					
dated 103:1 164:11		139:19 142:18			
decisions 73:9   depose 132:13   defined 103:15   desired 40:15   depose 132:13   depose 132:13   defined 103:15   depose 132:13   depose 132:13   depose 132:13   defined 103:15   depose 132:13   depose 132:13   defined 103:15   depose 132:13   defined 103:15   depose 132:13   defined 103:15   depose 132:13   depose 132:13   defined 103:15   depose 132:13   depose 132:13   different 101:21   described 34:6   defining 132:18   deficiencies 187:18   deficiencies			demon 157:24		
day 42: 163 26:21         decisions 73:9         denied 103:25         device 168:14         82:21         discovering 36:24           76:11 88:24:25         118:21 19:20         132:10 135:11         183:10         depose 132:13         48:21         discovery 14:15         18:6 19:25 25:13         discovery 14:15         18:6 19:25 25:13         48:221         discovery 14:15         18:6 19:25 25:13         18:6 19:25 25:13         48:221         discovery 14:15         18:6 19:25 25:13         18:6 19:25 25:13         18:6 19:25 25:13         48:221         discovery 14:15         18:6 19:25 25:13         18:6 19:25 25:13         48:221         discovery 14:15         18:6 19:25 25:13         48:221         discovery 14:15         18:6 19:25 25:13         48:221         discovery 14:15         48:21         48:221         48:221         48:221         48:21         48:22 14:23         48:21 49:22 23         48:21 14:14         48:21 49:22 23         48:21 14:14         48:15 49:25 25:13         48:21 49:22 23         48:21 14:14         48:15 49:25 25:13         48:21 49:22 22:13         48:21 49:22 22:13         48:21 49:22 22:13         48:21 49:22 22:13         48:21 49:22 22:13         48:22 14:24         48:22 14:24         48:21 49:22 22:13         48:21 49:22 22:13         48:21 49:22 22:13         48:21 49:22 22:13         48:21 49:22 23:34         49:22 13:13         49:22 13:13 <t< td=""><td></td><td>,</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>		,			
182-11   159-20   60-20   148-7   165-19   179-11   60-60   60-18   60-60   60-18   60-60   60-18   60-60   60-18   60-60   60-18   60-60   60-18   60-60   60-18   60-60   60-18   60-60   60-18   60-60   60-18   60-60   60-18   60-60   60-18   60-60   60-18   60-60   60-18   60-60   60-18				· •	
Tel: 18:24.25   Tel: 18:21					
118:22 121:2         deemed 66:18         dep 26:2         diagnosis 20:21         18:619:25 25:13           181:25 182:11         defendant 2:10,22         deposed 21:19,23         dejosed 21:19,23 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
163:14   180:9   160:15   160:15   160:15   160:15   160:15   181:25   182:11   201:11   3:4,11 4:12,23   160:15   160					
181:25   182:11   3:4,11 4:12,23   3:4,11 4:12,23   29:8   136:2   29:5   36:4   19:25   29:5   36:11   29:8   136:2   36:11   49:25   13:16,17   46:15 60:5,6   56:19,25 69:11   71:16,19 72:13,14   17:11   15:3   163:21   49:25   15:18   46:16 14   46:15 60:5,6   46:15 60:5,6   46:15 60:5,6   46:15 60:5,6   46:15 60:5,6   46:15 60:5,6   46:15 60:5,6   46:15 60:5,6   46:15 60:5,6   46:15 60:5,6   46:15 60:5,6   46:15 60:5,6   46:15 60:5,6   46:15 60:5,6   46:15 60:5,6   46:15 60:5,6   46:15 60:5,6   46:15 4:17   44:7 42:5 45:21   46:15 60:5,6   46:15 60:					
201:11					
days   15:9   190:11   DC 3:7   94:25   13:16,17   94:25   13:16,17   defendant   112:4   163:21   defendant   13:23   163:21   defendant   13:24   19:25   151:8   defendant   13:24   19:25   151:8   defendant   13:24   19:25   151:8   defendant   13:21   13:24   19:22   13:25   13:2					
DČ 3:7         dead 130:15 148:8         defendant's 112:4         deposition 26:2 29:5         53:4.19 118:1         71:16,19 72:13,14           153:3         deal 19:10 42:4         defendants 1:6 2:13         115:7,11 149:19         152:4 192:22,23         differences 128:5         60:00:16         differences 128:5         96:2 100:16         72:23 89:24 92:10         72:23 13:11         72:23 13:11         72:23 13:11         72:24 18:34:18         72:					
dead 130:15 148:8 153:3         defendant's 112:4 defendants 1:6 2:13 163:21         115:7,11 149:19 149:25 151:8 defendants 1:6 2:13 152:7,13,19 152:21 129:25 143:24 191:25 dealing 55:24 130:6 130:11 136:7 151:1         152:4 130:20 38:22 67:21 73:21 133:20         152:4 130:20 133:22 131:20 133:22 131:20         158:8 113:41 18:19 130:22 131:20         549 58:7 114:5 120:20 134:7 130:21 130:61 130:11 136:7 151:1         151:1 107:22 131:20         158:8 113:41 18:19         549 58:7 114:5 120:20 134:7 139:16 140:25 139:16 140:25 139:16 140:25 138:14,24 destribed 10:22 182:14,24 destribed 10:22 199:2         151:1 160:13 171:4 160:13 171:4 160:13 171:4 175:7         145:1 172:20 175:7         178:15 180:2 160:20 167:5 175:10 165:8 113:23 199:10 described 34:6 defense 6:18 31:2 deferend 10:13 128:16         160:13 171:4 160:13 171:4 160:13 171:4 160:13 171:4 160:13 171:4 160:13 171:4 175:7         145:1 172:20 175:7         178:15 180:2 175:10 165:8 160:20 167:5 175:10 165:8 160:20 177:3 175:10 165:8 115:21 100:15 188:18         160:20 167:5 160:20 167:5 175:10 165:8 160:20 177:1         160:13 171:4 175:10 165:8 160:22 175:10 160:20 167:5 175:10 165:8 160:13 171:4 175:10 160:20 167:5 175:10 160:20 160:20 160:1 175:10 160:20 167:5 175:10 160:20 167:5 175:10 160:20 167:5 175:10 160:20 167:5					•
163:3   163:21   149:25   151:8   differences   128:5   103:11,14   117:8   125:22   129:25   121:25   121:25   125:24   130:6   125:24   130:6   123:14   122   130:11   136:7   151:1   107:22   131:20   136:61   144:22   136:61   144:22   136:61   144:22   136:61   144:22   136:61   144:24   137:23   199:2   182:14,24   146:14   123:24   142:13   130:22   130:22   142:13   130:22   142:13   130:22   142:13   130:22   142:13   130:22   142:13   130:22   142:13   130:22   142:13   130:22   142:13   130:22   142:13   130:22   142:13   130:22   142:13   142:13   142:13   143:10   140:19   148:19   153:4   148:14   148:19   153:4   128:19   133:20   134:10   140:19   148:14   148:14   128:19   128:16   167:9   177:18,19   148:14   166:14   167:9   177:18,19   148:125   183:12   166:16   179:17   102:16   19 20:11   128:16   167:9   177:18,19   182:25   183:12   166:16   166:25   146:25   146:16   166:26   155:20   128:26   166:20   128:26   123:20   123:20   138:4   149:25   123:25   133:14,7   146:16   168:55   146:85   146:16   168:5   146:16   168:5   146:17   148:14   146:16   168:5   146:16		· ·			
deal 19:10 42:4         defendants 1:6 2:13         152:7,13,19         different 10:13 11:5         103:18,22 104:13           103:11,14 117:8         2:17 3:8 4:15,17         156:20 157:3         11:25 34:22 51:20         107:5,15 118:18           125:22 129:25         32:15,19 36:13         38:22 67:21 73:21         158:8         45:9 58:7 114:5         12:19 332:17,18           dealing 55:24 130:6         38:22 67:21 73:21         113:14 118:19         139:16 140:25         157:10 165:8           130:11 136:7         151:1         107:22 131:20         175:7         178:15 180:2         166:20 167:5           151:1         107:22 131:20         175:7         178:15 180:2         166:20 167:5           151:1         107:22 131:20         175:7         178:15 180:2         166:20 167:5           131:124 137:23         164:3 171:5         derived 10:22         178:15 180:2         166:21 167:5         166:21 172:20           death 16:14         defense 26:18 31:2         defense 80:18 31:2         describe 109:9         differentiate 53:4         differentiate 53:4         72:18           decades 37:6 45:2         defense 104:3         deferied 10:2         133:3 139:18         differentiate 53:4         145:3           decedent's 139:19         148:19 133:20         deficient 10:13         15:20 <td></td> <td></td> <td>· ·</td> <td></td> <td></td>			· ·		
103:11,14 117:8   2:17 3:8 4:15,17   156:20 157:3   11:25 34:22 51:20   107:5,15 118:18   125:22 129:25   5:24 7:14 31:22   132:24 191:25   32:15,19 36:13   133:14 118:19   139:16 140:25   157:10 165:8   130:11 136:7   151:1   107:22 131:20   166:13 171:4   175:7   178:15 180:2   166:20 167:5   157:10 165:8   130:11 136:67   151:1   107:22 131:20   164:3 171:5   164:3 171:5   164:3 171:5   164:3 171:5   164:3 171:5   164:3 171:5   164:3 171:5   164:3 171:5   164:3 171:5   164:3 171:5   164:3 171:5   164:3 171:5   164:3 171:5   164:3 171:5   164:3 171:5   165:20 167:5   178:15 180:2   166:20 167:5   169:1 172:20   166:20 167:5   169:1 172:20   166:20 167:5   169:1 172:20   166:20 167:5   169:1 172:20   166:20 167:5   169:1 172:20   166:20 167:5   169:1 172:20   166:20 167:5   169:1 172:20   166:20 167:5   169:1 172:20   166:20 167:5   169:1 172:20					
125:22 129:25					
143:24 191:25   dealing 55:24 130:6   138:22 67:21 73:21   139:24   160:13 171:4   118:19   139:16 140:25   166:20 167:5   177:10 165:8   177:10 165:2   1		,			•
dealing 55:24 130:6         38:22 67:21 73:21         113:14 118:19         139:16 140:25         157:10 165:8           130:11 136:7         81:11 89:24         160:13 171:4         145:1 172:20         166:20 167:5           deals 104:11 111:21         136:6 144:22         derivatively 98:21         188:4,5 189:21         discuss 8:2 159:10           111:24 137:23         164:3 171:5         derived 10:22         201:11         discussed 62:18,21           199:2         182:14,24         defense 26:18 31:2         describe 109:9         differentiate 53:4         differentiate 53:4         discussing 69:1,24           death 166:14         defense 26:18 31:2         describe 109:9         differentiate 53:4         differentiate 53:4         differentiate 53:4         discussing 69:1,24           death 84:11         45:6 65:22 72:4         133:3 139:18         145:20         difficulty 36:1         discussion 13:7           decades 37:6 45:2         deferral 72:1         describes 146:16         direct 130:14 131:3         discussions 64:6           139:18,19 133:20         138:16         48:19         155:10         describes 146:16         direct 130:14 131:3         discussions 64:6           decedent's 133:10         128:16         87:19         describes 165:23         direction 11:8         dismiss 26:14 33:21					•
130:11 136:7   151:1					· ·
151:1	_				
deals 104:11 111:21         136:6 144:22         derived 10:22         188:4,5 189:21         discuss 8:2 159:10           199:2         182:14,24         defreed 10:22         DESCR 87:19         differentiate 53:4         discussing 69:1,24           dear 184:11         36:14 38:5,18         36:12 33:3 139:18         differently 9:2         discussing 69:1,24           death 84:17 134:8         45:6 65:22 72:4         133:3 139:18         differently 36:1         discussing 69:1,24           debate 129:10         130:22         described 34:6         digestible 56:19         discussion 13:7           decades 37:6 45:2         defenses 104:3         deferice 12:1         describes 146:16         direct 130:14 131:3         discussions 64:6           134:10 140:19         148:19 153:4         deficiency 145:19         describing 28:6         131:23         155:20           148:14 1         define 70:25 79:24         description 87:12         152:1         discussions 64:6           134:10 140:19         128:16         define 70:25 79:24         description 87:12         152:1         dismiss 26:14 33:21           148:14         decedent's 133:10         80:4 110:15         20:1:16         direction 11:8         dismissed 35:8           December 6:7,24         197:23         desimate 65:23         130:15,24 200					
111:24 137:23   164:3 171:5   182:14,24   defense 26:18 31:2   describe 109:9   describe 109:9   describe 109:9   describe 34:6   differentiae 53:4   differentiae 5					
199:2   dealt 166:14   defense 26:18 31:2   deart 184:11   36:14 38:5,18   133:3 139:18   145:20   differently 9:2   differs 109:17   describe 109:9   133:3 139:18   145:20   differs 109:17   described 34:6   digestible 56:19   dignity 30:21 199:9   122:22 135:8   described 34:6   dignity 30:21 199:9   describes 146:16   deficience 187:18   deficiencies 187:18   deficiencies 187:18   deficiencies 187:18   deficient 101:3   describing 28:6   131:23   discussions 64:6   155:20   describing 28:6   describing 28:6   155:20   discussions 64:6   describing 28:6   discoussions 64:6   discoussions 64:					
dealt 166:14 dear 184:11         defense 26:18 31:2 36:14 38:5,18         describe 109:9 133:3 139:18         differently 9:2 differs 109:17 difficulty 36:1 digestible 56:19 describes 37:6 45:2 defenses 104:3 deferral 72:1 describes 146:16 deficiency 145:19 deficiency 145:19 deficient 101:3 describing 28:6 134:10 140:19 148:14 deficient 101:3 decedent's 139:19 148:14 decedent's 139:19 102:16,19 202:11 decide 15:4 56:18 167:9 177:18,19 182:25 183:12 decided 16:21 55:19 defining 132:18 decided 16:21 55:19 decided 16:5 46:18 166:5 decided 16:5 46:18 decided 15:12 deciding 26:14 delay 74:16 delay 72:14 73:2 decided 16:11         defense 26:18 31:2 describe 109:9 difficulty 36:1 difficulty 36:1 difficulty 36:1 digestible 56:19 discussion 13:7 discuss					
dear 184:11         36:14 38:5,18         133:3 139:18         differs 109:17         145:3           debath 84:17 134:8         45:6 65:22 72:4         145:20         difficulty 36:1         discussion 13:7           debate 129:10         130:22         defenses 104:3         described 34:6         digestible 56:19         23:15 70:17 106:2           142:13         defenses 104:3         defersed 72:1         describes 146:16         digestible 56:19         122:22 135:8           decades 37:6 45:2         deferred 72:18         deferred 72:18         describes 146:16         direct 130:14 131:3         discussions 64:6           109:18,19 133:20         deficiencies 187:18         deficiency 145:19         describing 28:6         131:23         155:20         discussions 64:6           134:10 140:19         deficienty 145:19         describing 28:6         131:23         discussions 64:6         discussions 64:6           148:14         deficienty 145:19         describing 28:6         131:23         discussions 64:6         discussions 64:6           148:14         define 70:25 79:24         describe 135:24         direction 11:8         discussions 64:6           12:16         define 70:25 79:24         describe 19:9         directly 43:10 47:23         dismissed 35:8           102:16,19 20:11         97:4					
death 84:17 134:8         45:6 65:22 72:4         145:20         difficulty 36:1         discussion 13:7           debate 129:10         130:22         defenses 104:3         described 34:6         digestible 56:19         discussion 13:7           decades 37:6 45:2         defenses 104:3         deferred 72:18         describes 146:16         dire 136:18         150:10           decedent 84:14         deficiencies 187:18         describing 28:6         131:23         direct 130:14 131:3         discussions 64:6           199:18,19 133:20         deficient 101:3         describing 28:6         131:23         discussions 64:6         155:20           148:19 153:4         deficient 101:3         description 87:12         description 87:12         direct 130:14 131:3         discussions 64:6           128:16         80:4 110:15         20:1:16         description 87:12         direction 11:8         discussion 13:7           December 6:7,24         128:16         80:4:110:15         20:1:16         directly 43:10 47:23         dismiss 26:14 33:21           December 6:7,24         197:23         designate 65:23         disadvantage 18:8         disposition 36:19           162:16,19 202:11         97:4 109:10,19,20         description 12:8         description 83:23         description 83:23         description 83:23         descrip					_
debate 129:10         130:22         described 34:6         digestible 56:19         23:15 70:17 106:2           142:13         defenses 104:3         describes 146:16         dignity 30:21 199:9         122:22 135:8           decades 37:6 45:2         deferral 72:1         describes 146:16         direct 130:14 131:3         150:10           decedent 84:14         deficiencies 187:18         describing 28:6         131:23         155:20           134:10 140:19         deficient 101:3         describing 28:6         131:23         discussions 64:6           148:19 153:4         deficient 101:3         describing 28:6         131:23         discussions 64:6           decedent's 139:19         128:16         87:19         description 87:12         152:1         discase 20:19           decedents' 133:10         80:4 110:15         201:16         direction 11:8         dismiss 26:14 33:21           decedents' 133:10         80:4 110:15         201:16         disadvantage 18:8         dismissed 35:8           December 6:7,24         197:23         designate 65:23         disadvantage 18:8         disposition 36:19           decide 15:4 56:18         110:16         destroyed 112:8         details 105:2         disagreement 135:9         dispositions 138:4           decide 15:4 56:18         46:13 13		•			
142:13         defenses 104:3 decades 37:6 45:2         deferral 72:1 decedent 84:14         describes 146:16 direct 130:14 131:3         direct 130:14 131:3 discussions 64:6 direct 130:14 131:3         150:10 discussions 64:6 discussions 64:6 direct 130:14 131:3         150:10 discussions 64:6 discussions 64:6 direct 130:14 131:3         150:10 discussions 64:6 discussion 64:					
decades 37:6 45:2         deferral 72:1         describes 146:16         dire 136:18         dire 136:18         discussions 64:6           109:18,19 133:20         134:10 140:19         deficiency 145:19         describing 28:6         131:23         discussions 64:6           134:10 140:19         148:19 153:4         deficient 101:3         29:16 135:24         directed 150:8         discase 20:19           148:14         define 70:25 79:24         description 87:12         152:1         dismiss 26:14 33:21           decedents' 133:10         define 70:25 79:24         deserves 199:9         direction 11:8         139:20           describtion 87:12         directly 43:10 47:23         dismissal 98:13           decedents' 133:10         197:23         designate 65:23         disadvantage 18:8         disagree 73:6,7 79:7         disposition 36:19           102:16,19 202:11         97:4 109:10,19,20         destroyed 112:8         desagree 73:6,7 79:7         disagreement 135:9         dispositions 138:4           167:9 177:18,19         defining 132:18         definition 98:3,23         detribion 12:8         desagree 73:6,7 79:7         dispositions 138:4           decide 168:5         46:13 133:1,4,7         177:25 183:14,18         disclose 60:14         disclose 60:14         disclose 60:14         disclose 60:14         disclosure 7:8 8:					
decedent 84:14         deferred 72:18         deficiencies 187:18         describing 28:6         direct 130:14 131:3         discussions 64:6           134:10 140:19         deficiency 145:19         deficiency 145:19         describing 28:6         131:23         discussions 64:6           148:19 153:4         deficient 101:3         description 87:12         152:1         dismiss 26:14 33:21           decedent's 139:19         128:16         87:19         direction 11:8         139:20           decedents' 133:10         80:4 110:15         201:16         directly 43:10 47:23         dismissal 98:13           December 6:7,24         197:23         designate 65:23         130:15,24 200:15         80:17 98:12           102:16,19 202:11         97:4 109:10,19,20         desert 123:5         disagree 73:6,7 79:7         dispositions 138:4           decide 15:4 56:18         110:16         details 105:2         disagreement 135:9         disproportional           182:25 183:12         definition 98:3,23         deferauded 44:24         164:17 176:6         disclose 60:14         51:19 53:22 60:21           decides 15:12         degree 148:24         186:6,21 187:11         disclosure 7:8 8:6         60:25 61:18 70:19           decides 15:1         delay 74:16         delays 72:14 73:2         determine 85:5         46:8 5					
109:18,19 133:20         deficiencies 187:18         describing 28:6         131:23         155:20           134:10 140:19         deficiency 145:19         29:16 135:24         directed 150:8         disease 20:19           148:19 153:4         deficient 101:3         29:16 135:24         direction 11:8         139:20           decedent's 139:19         128:16         87:19         direction 11:8         139:20           decedents' 133:10         80:4 110:15         201:16         directly 43:10 47:23         dismissal 98:13           December 6:7,24         197:23         designate 65:23         130:15,24 200:15         80:17 98:12           7:2,18 69:23 99:7         defined 7:22 13:1         despite 134:11         disadvantage 18:8         disposition 36:19           decide 15:4 56:18         110:16         destroyed 112:8         185:23         disproportional           167:9 177:18,19         definition 98:3,23         determination         disappoint 193:7         dispute 9:25,25           decided 16:21 55:19         defrauded 44:24         164:17 176:6         disclosed 96:3 104:9         60:25 61:18 70:19           decides 15:12         degree 148:24         186:6,21 187:11         disclosure 7:8 8:6         175:16           deciding 26:14         delays 72:14 73:2         determine 85:5					
134:10 140:19         deficiency 145:19         29:16 135:24         directed 150:8         disease 20:19           148:19 153:4         deficient 101:3         87:19         disease 20:19         dismiss 26:14 33:21           148:14         128:16         87:19         direction 11:8         dismiss 26:14 33:21           148:14         define 70:25 79:24         deserves 199:9         directly 43:10 47:23         dismissal 98:13           decedents' 133:10         197:23         designate 65:23         130:15,24 200:15         dismissed 35:8           7:2,18 69:23 99:7         defined 7:22 13:1         despite 134:11         disadvantage 18:8         disposition 36:19           102:16,19 202:11         97:4 109:10,19,20         destroyed 112:8         185:23         dispositions 138:4           167:9 177:18,19         defining 132:18         details 105:2         details 105:2         disagreement 135:9         dispositions 138:4           182:25 183:12         definition 98:3,23         determination         disclose 60:14         51:19 53:22 60:21           decides 15:12         degree 148:24         186:6,21 187:11         disclosing 47:7         83:13,15 117:12           deciding 26:14         delays 72:14 73:2         determine 85:5         46:8 54:2 55:9         distinction 65:5					
148:19 153:4         deficient 101:3         description 87:12         152:1         dismiss 26:14 33:21           decedent's 139:19 148:14         define 70:25 79:24         deserves 199:9         direction 11:8         dismiss 26:14 33:21           decedents' 133:10         B0:4 110:15         201:16         directly 43:10 47:23         dismissal 98:13           December 6:7,24         197:23         designate 65:23         disadvantage 18:8         80:17 98:12           7:2,18 69:23 99:7 102:16,19 202:11         97:4 109:10,19,20         dessert 123:5         disagree 73:6,7 79:7         disposition 36:19           decide 15:4 56:18 167:9 177:18,19 182:25 183:12         defining 132:18         details 105:2         desagreement 135:9         disappoint 193:7           decided 16:21 55:19 decided 16:21 55:19 decides 15:12         defrauded 44:24         164:17 176:6         disclose 60:14         disclosed 96:3 104:9         60:25 61:18 70:19           decides 15:12 deciding 26:14 186:11         delay 74:16         193:24         determine 85:5         46:8 54:2 55:9         distinction 65:5			O		
decedent's 139:19         128:16         87:19         direction 11:8         139:20           decedents' 133:10         80:4 110:15         201:16         directly 43:10 47:23         dismissal 98:13           December 6:7,24         197:23         designate 65:23         disadvantage 18:8         disposition 36:19           102:16,19 202:11         97:4 109:10,19,20         designate 65:23         disagree 73:6,7 79:7         dispositions 138:4           decide 15:4 56:18         defining 132:18         defining 132:18         details 105:2         desagreement 135:9         disagreement 135:9         dispositions 138:4           decided 16:21 55:19         definition 98:3,23         determination         disclose 60:14         51:19 53:22 60:21           decides 15:12         degree 148:24         186:6,21 187:11         disclosing 47:7         83:13,15 117:12           deciding 26:14         delays 72:14 73:2         determine 85:5         46:8 54:2 55:9         distinction 65:5					
148:14         define 70:25 79:24         deserves 199:9         directives 150:24         dismissal 98:13           decedents' 133:10         December 6:7,24         80:4 110:15         201:16         directly 43:10 47:23         dismissed 35:8           7:2,18 69:23 99:7 102:16,19 202:11         defined 7:22 13:1         despite 134:11         disadvantage 18:8         80:17 98:12           decide 15:4 56:18 167:9 177:18,19 182:25 183:12         defining 132:18         details 105:2         destroyed 112:8         disagree 73:6,7 79:7         dispositions 138:4           decided 16:21 55:19 decided 16:21 55:19 decides 15:12         definition 98:3,23         determination         disclose 60:14         51:19 53:22 60:21           decides 15:12 deciding 26:14 186:11         delay 74:16         186:6,21 187:11         disclosure 7:8 8:6         46:8 54:2 55:9         distinction 65:5			_		
decedents' 133:10         80:4 110:15         201:16         directly 43:10 47:23         dismissed 35:8           December 6:7,24         197:23         designate 65:23         130:15,24 200:15         80:17 98:12           7:2,18 69:23 99:7         defined 7:22 13:1         despite 134:11         disadvantage 18:8         disposition 36:19           decide 15:4 56:18         110:16         descryed 112:8         disagree 73:6,7 79:7         dispositions 138:4           167:9 177:18,19         defining 132:18         definition 98:3,23         details 105:2         disagreement 135:9         dispositions 138:4           decided 16:21 55:19         defrauded 44:24         164:17 176:6         disclose 60:14         51:19 53:22 60:21           decides 15:12         degree 148:24         186:6,21 187:11         disclosing 47:7         83:13,15 117:12           deciding 26:14         delay 74:16         delay 72:14 73:2         determine 85:5         46:8 54:2 55:9         distinction 65:5			0,1-2		
December 6:7,24         197:23         designate 65:23         130:15,24 200:15         80:17 98:12           7:2,18 69:23 99:7         defined 7:22 13:1         97:4 109:10,19,20         despite 134:11         disadvantage 18:8         disposition 36:19           decide 15:4 56:18         110:16         destroyed 112:8         disagree 73:6,7 79:7         dispositions 138:4           167:9 177:18,19         defining 132:18         definition 98:3,23         details 105:2         disagreement 135:9         dispositions 138:4           decided 16:21 55:19         definition 98:3,23         determination         disclose 60:14         51:19 53:22 60:21           decides 15:12         degree 148:24         186:6,21 187:11         disclosed 96:3 104:9         60:25 61:18 70:19           deciding 26:14         delay 74:16         193:24         disclosure 7:8 8:6         175:16           186:11         delays 72:14 73:2         determine 85:5         46:8 54:2 55:9         distinction 65:5					
7:2,18 69:23 99:7 102:16,19 202:11       defined 7:22 13:1 97:4 109:10,19,20 110:16       despite 134:11 dessert 123:5 destroyed 112:8 110:16       disadvantage 18:8 disagree 73:6,7 79:7 disagree 73:6,7 79:7 disagreement 135:9 defining 132:18 defining 132:18 definition 98:3,23 definition 98:3,23 definition 98:3,23 decided 16:21 55:19 decider 168:5 decides 15:12 decides 15:12 deciding 26:14 186:11       defined 7:22 13:1 despite 134:11 disagree 73:6,7 79:7 disagreement 135:9 disa				7	
102:16,19 202:11       97:4 109:10,19,20       dessert 123:5       disagree 73:6,7 79:7       dispositions 138:4         decide 15:4 56:18       110:16       defining 132:18       defining 132:18       details 105:2       disagreement 135:9       disproportional         182:25 183:12       definition 98:3,23       defrauded 44:24       determination       disclose 60:14       51:19 53:22 60:21         decider 168:5       46:13 133:1,4,7       degree 148:24       186:6,21 187:11       disclosed 96:3 104:9       60:25 61:18 70:19         deciding 26:14       delay 74:16       193:24       disclosure 7:8 8:6       175:16         186:11       delays 72:14 73:2       determine 85:5       46:8 54:2 55:9       distinction 65:5	•				
decide 15:4 56:18         110:16         destroyed 112:8         185:23         disproportional disagreement 135:9           167:9 177:18,19         defining 132:18         definition 98:3,23         details 105:2         disagreement 135:9         114:13           decided 16:21 55:19         defrauded 44:24         164:17 176:6         disclose 60:14         51:19 53:22 60:21           decider 168:5         46:13 133:1,4,7         186:6,21 187:11         disclosed 96:3 104:9         60:25 61:18 70:19           decides 15:12         degree 148:24         186:6,21 187:11         disclosure 7:8 8:6         175:16           deciding 26:14         delays 72:14 73:2         determine 85:5         46:8 54:2 55:9         distinction 65:5	*		_		
167:9 177:18,19       defining 132:18       details 105:2       disagreement 135:9       114:13         182:25 183:12       definition 98:3,23       determination       disappoint 193:7       dispute 9:25,25         decided 16:21 55:19       defrauded 44:24       46:13 133:1,4,7       disclose 60:14       51:19 53:22 60:21         decides 15:12       degree 148:24       186:6,21 187:11       disclosing 47:7       83:13,15 117:12         deciding 26:14       delay 74:16       193:24       disclosure 7:8 8:6       175:16         186:11       delays 72:14 73:2       determine 85:5       46:8 54:2 55:9       distinction 65:5	•			_	
182:25 183:12       definition 98:3,23       determination       disappoint 193:7       dispute 9:25,25         decided 16:21 55:19       defrauded 44:24       164:17 176:6       disclose 60:14       51:19 53:22 60:21         decider 168:5       46:13 133:1,4,7       degree 148:24       186:6,21 187:11       disclosing 47:7       83:13,15 117:12         deciding 26:14       delay 74:16       193:24       disclosure 7:8 8:6       175:16         186:11       delays 72:14 73:2       determine 85:5       46:8 54:2 55:9       distinction 65:5					
decided 16:21 55:19         defrauded 44:24         164:17 176:6         disclose 60:14         51:19 53:22 60:21           decider 168:5         46:13 133:1,4,7         177:25 183:14,18         disclosed 96:3 104:9         60:25 61:18 70:19           decides 15:12         degree 148:24         186:6,21 187:11         disclosing 47:7         83:13,15 117:12           deciding 26:14         delay 74:16         193:24         disclosure 7:8 8:6         175:16           descider 188:11         delay 72:14 73:2         determine 85:5         46:8 54:2 55:9         distinction 65:5				<u> </u>	
decider 168:5         46:13 133:1,4,7         177:25 183:14,18         disclosed 96:3 104:9         60:25 61:18 70:19           decides 15:12         degree 148:24         186:6,21 187:11         disclosing 47:7         83:13,15 117:12           deciding 26:14         delay 74:16         193:24         disclosure 7:8 8:6         175:16           delays 72:14 73:2         determine 85:5         46:8 54:2 55:9         distinction 65:5		· ·			
decides 15:12         degree 148:24         186:6,21 187:11         disclosing 47:7         83:13,15 117:12           deciding 26:14         delay 74:16         193:24         disclosure 7:8 8:6         175:16           delays 72:14 73:2         determine 85:5         46:8 54:2 55:9         distinction 65:5					
deciding 26:14         delay 74:16         193:24         disclosure 7:8 8:6         175:16           186:11         delays 72:14 73:2         determine 85:5         46:8 54:2 55:9         distinction 65:5					
186:11 <b>delays</b> 72:14 73:2 <b>determine</b> 85:5 46:8 54:2 55:9 <b>distinction</b> 65:5		_	· ·		
	_				
<b>decision</b> 16:5,8 34:9 <b>deletions</b> 88:5,7   137:19 163:19   91:23 92:7,19,21   138:25 139:2		· ·			
	<b>decision</b> 16:5,8 34:9	deletions 88:5,7	137:19 163:19	91:23 92:7,19,21	138:25 139:2
<u> </u>		1	1		<u> </u>

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 214 of 233 PageID: 48249

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

				1 agc 213
distinguishes 54:20	183:20	62:9 70:11 79:3	195:13	119:20 120:3
<b>District</b> 1:1,1 181:1	dollars 118:14	98:7 112:25	entries 6:21 22:14	177:13 192:17
<b>Division</b> 204:22	193:21	136:20 155:6	24:20 61:4,5	evidentiary 165:9
DLCO 86:17	<b>Donna</b> 143:14	163:6 167:11	67:19 94:19	ex 164:9,13 165:11
do-over 185:2	door 56:3	186:5,6 189:4	entry 52:7 100:21	165:20,24 167:8
docket 20:21 85:9	Dornbusch 3:11	201:18	102:21 200:13,19	171:13 178:17
200:13 201:20,23	4:24	electronic 116:22	201:20,23	186:15 187:5
docketed 6:9 102:22	double 201:17	200:21	equally 136:15	192:21 195:11
docketing 201:2	double-space	electronically 121:6	equals 39:14	exact 24:20 93:3
doctor 21:19 51:2	162:17,25	electronics 64:4	equation 26:14,18	161:4
85:15,15	double-spaced	elements 10:7	28:2	exactly 21:4 30:4,5
doctors 21:13 32:12	163:3	Ellis 2:7 3:2 29:9	equity 185:15	36:3 45:7,8 60:15
34:20 39:22 48:22	doubt 66:22	123:21	especially 10:25	60:17 186:18
48:23 49:3 50:21	Dr 37:4,5	emergent 203:10,13	19:7 168:24 205:9	204:24
51:2 70:18	drafted 204:7	203:20 204:2,21	<b>ESQ</b> 1:16,17 2:4,5,5	exam 86:2,14,14
doctors' 45:12	drafts 157:21,21	EMP 88:3	2:9,13,16,22,24	<b>examine</b> 191:9
doctrine 44:13	drain 120:12,14	emphasize 12:10	3:4,7,11	example 14:25
57:23	draw 65:5 139:2	employed 88:4	essence 202:24	30:11 39:19 49:13
document 58:8	drew 138:24	<b>employee</b> 206:10,12	essentially 12:2,15	64:6 65:21 137:5
94:19 112:16	Drive 1:15	employees 146:24	56:2 67:17 82:9	143:4 167:21
121:4 139:10	due 33:8 45:17	employer 21:11	136:8 139:9	examples 25:3 65:15
146:20 165:23	158:25 165:5	84:18,19 88:3	established 36:8	exceeds 198:5
167:6 173:23	166:6 181:21	employment 84:19	61:14 182:21	Excellent 205:2
178:15 179:23	duty 14:9 120:1,3	84:20	estate 160:18,21	<b>exception</b> 6:1 55:10
190:2	uuty 1 115 12011,6	ended 84:20 90:12	161:5,13	68:24 74:11
documents 10:11		90:15,17	estates 133:10	158:22 163:20,20
101:13,23 104:1	E 2:13,16	engage 49:22 188:3	et 1:3,6	167:14 174:21
104:12,14 111:25	E-electronic 82:9	engaged 29:10	ethical 16:24 22:3	exceptions 6:1
112:5,9,12,25	e-mail 5:5 63:22	Engelhard 33:12,17	ethically 15:21	174:22
113:11,13 114:1	78:17,18 101:4	34:7 39:17 105:5	ethics 15:23 16:25	exchanged 11:5
116:16 117:2,10	103:1 104:18	105:8 134:21	EUGENE 2:9	exchanging 75:8
117:10 119:9,15	128:1 163:13,22	139:20 145:24	eve 180:5,8	excluded 51:3
120:18 131:1,24	164:6	Engelhard's 145:25	event 41:5 92:21	excluding 50:21
135:14 138:10	e-mails 42:10 62:19	Engelhard/BASF	164:24 204:16	excuse 86:3
139:8 144:15	75:8 101:9 191:7	39:7	everybody 4:2	exercise 36:16
155:16 165:10,13	ear 77:22	Engelhard/Cahill's	16:24 23:25 24:5	128:11,11 157:24
165:22 166:24	earlier 41:10 44:19	146:25	36:22 42:18 43:5	exhibits 118:21
167:17,23 170:23	early 2:18 45:2	English-to-English	46:1 48:17 73:15	exist 64:18 132:17
171:17,21 172:1,6	91:17 160:13,13	30:7	74:1 86:23 87:2	135:21
172:8,9,11,14,23	easier 63:8,11 72:7	enter 136:1 204:6	94:5 120:8,23	existed 135:20
173:6,6 174:1,9	82:24 106:21	<b>entered</b> 6:25 17:5	125:11 126:5,11	148:19
174:10,17,23	163:8 172:5 190:8	203:25	148:25 155:22	exists 14:24 132:18
175:19 176:8	easily 47:19 56:19	entertain 96:7	157:18 158:15	142:7
178:5,7,14 179:14	East 1:15	entire 8:7 9:12	162:17 166:10	expand 112:3
180:20 187:24	ECF 6:9,24 7:2,18	10:18 11:12 13:8	184:3,15,16	expansive 54:24
189:6 190:12	8:15,16 99:7	26:2 92:15 121:3	189:22	expect 73:25 193:4
196:12	102:16,19,22	entities 67:14,20	everybody's 94:7	expected 135:2
<b>Doe</b> 37:19,20	104:4 200:1,10	69:5 105:1	142:11	expedition 31:12
dog 100:3 168:10	effect 186:7	entitled 7:14 32:19	Everything's 116:22	experience 167:4
dogs 40:22,23,25	effort 126:1 131:20	36:23 45:21 61:9	<b>evidence</b> 17:5 31:7	168:17
doing 32:12 34:20	149:1,5 157:2,6	73:15 93:9,10	37:5 48:23 51:12	expert 20:12 50:4
39:24 118:3	<b>efforts</b> 105:7 140:19	96:1,4 107:17	51:16 56:10 89:20	57:8,9 95:14,21
10-1-1011	145:12,21	123:22 149:20	92:16 98:11,16	95:25 96:1,2
126:15 134:4				
126:15 134:4 142:19 150:9	either 10:6 24:13	151:11 155:19	112:21 113:18	111:6
		151:11 155:19 156:22 166:20	112:21 113:18 115:22,24 118:24	111:6 experts 21:24 32:2

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 215 of 233 PageID: 48250

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

				Page 214
	1	l	l	1
33:13 34:1 39:9	157:6 167:11	108:1 111:22,24	<b>fight</b> 74:1 100:4	170:20 172:5
48:23,25 49:22	176:15 183:20	114:19,24 115:3	118:22 168:10	175:6 178:2 180:6
51:6,16 95:20	184:9	115:14,15,19	<b>figure</b> 188:7 189:2	185:21 186:16
147:4	factors 82:19	116:25 117:14	<b>figured</b> 36:11 119:3	fine 41:14 62:11
experts' 49:16	facts 34:5 36:7,17	119:6 121:13	147:21 179:4	63:24 72:21 73:7
explain 112:1	36:24 101:14	124:12 128:3	204:9	80:8 102:10 124:4
139:15,17 145:11	136:7	129:4,11,14,22	<b>file</b> 25:22 26:3 49:17	125:15 136:15
explained 70:10	<b>factual</b> 106:16	135:22 136:25	58:3 98:17 106:2	159:7 184:23
explains 193:19	136:9 138:8	137:3,10,23 138:1	122:10 150:12,13	198:9 200:12
explanation 140:11	196:15	138:7,12,19,24	160:17 165:12	201:14,17,20
145:22	<b>failed</b> 100:15 176:20	139:6,14 140:16	177:23 180:16,24	202:2
explore 35:3	181:12	140:18 141:3	181:25 182:24	finesse 201:22
explored 147:2	failing 191:2	143:3,6 144:25	185:4 186:20	finessing 141:21
<b>exposed</b> 85:18 98:5	failure 176:20	145:10 147:20,23	189:3,4,10 191:19	<b>fingers</b> 158:3,9
98:21	<b>fair</b> 19:21 25:16	149:10,20 151:3	191:22 192:3	<b>finish</b> 21:5 23:10
exposure 21:12	35:5,7 36:24	160:8 188:15	195:1 199:14	finished 53:1
123:16	40:10 126:5	189:13,14	200:1,7,13,14	<b>finite</b> 174:22 178:5
extensive 55:21	144:12 165:5	Farrell's 28:1,20	201:12,13	178:7
67:22	177:10 184:17	63:19 104:17	<b>filed</b> 6:7 7:3,19,21	firepower 42:2
extent 26:18 65:20	185:5 187:16	128:1	7:23 8:17 20:15	<b>firm</b> 4:19 7:20 11:3
96:10 153:25	193:16	fatal 185:11	21:20,21 24:4,6,9	11:8,9 13:12 17:8
155:4 193:25	<b>fairly</b> 42:1,7,9 72:11	fatally 185:1	24:13 29:10 41:11	17:9,18,23 18:4
195:8	<b>faith</b> 149:1,4 157:6	fault 205:6	53:13 73:23 76:18	35:22 54:13 89:11
extinguished 45:7	<b>fall</b> 66:8	<b>favor</b> 186:20	81:12 85:12,13	96:15 97:1 116:19
extra 190:14,16	<b>falls</b> 1:15 94:15	February 77:18	98:7 99:8 101:16	146:20 184:23
extracted 20:18	106:18 119:14	160:13	102:20 103:19	firm's 9:22 10:22
<b>eye</b> 120:15	<b>false</b> 44:12 77:9	<b>federal</b> 17:5 44:20	117:14 123:15	54:11 99:12
eyes 65:24 91:22	<b>familiar</b> 43:12 76:21	50:20 56:10 66:20	124:8 136:24	<b>firms</b> 30:17 116:20
	191:3	89:20 92:16,22	163:12 165:16	<b>first</b> 6:12 9:8,11
F	<b>family</b> 21:14 132:6	112:21 115:25	184:25 191:12	38:19,21 39:25
<b>F</b> 2:9,18	134:6 135:16	126:22 166:16	200:17	40:5 57:5 61:1
face 31:4 34:8 35:1	<b>family's</b> 133:3	168:24 175:15	<b>files</b> 7:11,11 15:18	64:17 80:3 81:1
39:8	<b>fan</b> 163:7	<b>fee</b> 87:12,12	15:19,21 16:21	84:3,7 90:25,25
facia 170:18 171:3	<b>far</b> 12:19 20:7 35:25	<b>feel</b> 13:21 27:12	23:17 29:11	100:3,9,13,23
facie 31:19 164:18	68:21 76:6 88:18	65:2 105:17 181:7	121:16 150:7,7,11	102:24 104:14,19
169:25 172:6	98:25 125:16	feeling 80:22	177:24 182:23	104:21 106:22
176:5 177:3,8,25	133:19 162:14	<b>felt</b> 54:13	189:8	107:5 128:19,22
178:2,3,8 185:22	199:22 202:4	<b>fen-phen</b> 34:22	<b>filing</b> 15:9 42:3 91:2	129:4,8,13,14,17
186:16,22,25	Farrell 2:9 4:11,11	39:20 43:11 44:1	102:12,18 148:11	130:7 146:14
187:11,21 188:13	22:22 24:16,19,24	44:4	159:24 163:18,24	156:21,25 158:20
193:24 194:2	26:9,10,12 28:16	FEV 86:15	164:13 166:6	160:2 164:14
facility 146:21,23	28:21 48:9,12	<b>fewer</b> 139:17	197:5 200:9,15,22	167:10 176:11
fact 10:10 18:22	52:2,7,10,13,22	Fiberglass 46:14	<b>filings</b> 87:9 162:12	181:11 186:10
32:10 33:17 36:3	57:1 58:11,17,17	<b>fide</b> 126:1	163:23	187:11,14,19
36:21 37:19,20	59:14,17,25 60:15	<b>field</b> 47:16 51:19,20	<b>fill</b> 171:6	199:2 202:15
44:15 46:12,18,19	61:11 63:25 64:4	94:20,22	<b>filled</b> 83:23,24	firsthand 134:12
46:21,24 47:2,5	64:5 67:17 68:13	<b>fields</b> 3:7 4:16,16,20	<b>film</b> 84:22,24 85:2	146:3,17 151:2
57:18 58:4 66:18	68:24 71:4,12	8:9 9:24 18:2 29:1	<b>final</b> 157:23 194:4	153:18 154:18
66:20 69:13,19	75:6 79:4,12 82:8	58:12,15,18 75:12	<b>finally</b> 36:18 39:21	<b>fishing</b> 31:12
71:1,16 73:23	84:24 85:4,25	78:21 79:6,8,10	68:15 92:11	<b>five</b> 119:7 156:6
75:24 92:4,6,7,13	86:3,6,10 88:6,9	79:19 82:20,21	147:21 194:17	188:15
104:24 107:3	88:12 89:5 91:4	83:1,23 84:25	financially 206:13	five-thousandth
119:12 123:24	94:12,15 100:25	86:1 88:9,14	<b>find</b> 9:18 18:4 25:3	40:2
127:1 138:9	101:7 103:2	96:11	36:17 81:5 112:14	<b>fix</b> 162:8 180:14,15
149:14,15 150:17	105:18 106:8,15	Fifteenth 2:8 3:3	126:20 150:13	180:16,21 185:11
	l		l	

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 216 of 233 PageID: 48251

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

				Page 215
185:15	frankly 41:8 46:9	156:16 204:7	197:25	185:7,9,21 186:15
flaw 185:12	47:24 52:16 72:7	genesis 32:20	going 5:20,20 6:3,4	186:17,19 187:17
flawed 185:12	112:5 127:13	genesis 32:20 getting 19:9 21:9	9:1,18 13:18	190:21 191:12,17
flip 185:7,8	135:22 159:19	48:15,15 68:9	18:11 27:22 28:3	190:21 191:12,17
floating 89:22	160:11 172:4	95:16,21 99:20	28:7 29:21 34:18	191:18 192:3,14
floor 1:11 2:15,21	fraud 6:1 113:19,20	105:24 114:14	38:17 39:5,16	193:15 194:14,15
29:17	113:20,23 163:20	135:25 143:2	41:9,19,25 42:4	193:15 194:14,15
129:17 flow 66:3	165:9,19 167:13	145:22 153:6	42:13,14 45:19	194:25 195:20
fly 201:25	169:25 170:19	159:5 168:20	48:11 56:18 59:20	198:3,23 199:9,14
focus 158:13	171:4 174:21	give 5:15 79:17,18	59:20 63:9,12,12	198.3,23 199.9,14
focused 64:13 97:22	175:6,17 176:6	80:15 89:23 106:2	63:13,16,20,21	202:12 203:7
FOLEY 2:11	187:22 194:3,5	106:10 125:8	64:10 70:25 71:9	204:10,22,23
folks 36:23 99:20	fraudulent 43:15	126:5,24 129:21	71:18 72:5,6,9,14	golden 125:14
155:23	70:17 130:12	149:8 155:19	72:19 73:2,11,12	good 4:1 5:8,10 73:9
folks' 73:2	fraudulently 35:8	172:13 174:9	73:13,16,25 74:2	99:5 116:3,12
follow 73:11 125:11	free 105:17	177:12 178:4,6,15	74:5,12,14,18,19	117:4 119:10
181:12 185:20	Friday 180:12 181:7	180:24 183:14	74:24 75:2,3 76:8	149:1,4 157:6,25
200:16	friend 80:23	190:11,11,13	76:10,20,23 77:13	164:5 204:13
<b>followed</b> 181:19	front 82:11 94:2	198:15 204:4	77:19 78:12 79:2	Goodyear 146:21
183:9,9	129:20 178:24	given 19:7 22:17	79:9,10,11,16,17	Goodyear's 146:24
<b>following</b> 20:18	full 41:19 79:7	33:11 65:18 69:17	79:18,19 80:1,1	goofy 116:7
83:17,20 95:6	137:17 146:14	96:24 107:23	81:5,10 83:5,7,9	goose 8:18 59:21
166:22 173:25	194:1	109:2 110:13	84:1,3,6,10,15,16	115:4 116:12
193:25	full-blown 59:4	153:2 157:6	84:17,25 86:10	goose/gander
<b>follows</b> 46:3 165:17	fulsome 150:22	194:25 199:9	89:19 93:14 94:8	117:16 119:16
180:19	<b>function</b> 86:1,13,15	gives 9:23 149:5	95:8,9,19 96:10	Gordon 5:24 22:12
font 163:1	86:16 114:19,20	giving 11:11 30:21	98:24 99:14,19	23:22 164:2 166:4
football 42:10	160:11 161:14,15	95:1 180:15	100:22 106:14	gotten 118:20 126:8
<b>forced</b> 16:22	203:4	glad 11:20 137:4	108:17 109:21	139:10 172:20
foregoing 206:5	fundamental 186:7	196:25	110:14,22 111:14	govern 53:6
forfeiture 60:6	fundamentally	glasses 162:22	121:24 122:7,8,9	<b>grab</b> 162:13
forget 117:22	180:11	<b>glib</b> 153:8	122:22 123:8	<b>Grace</b> 50:20
134:23 135:7	<b>further</b> 35:4 47:5	<b>go</b> 9:19 16:23 22:2,2	124:7,11,19	grammar 128:11
form 11:17 12:2,5	93:13 104:13	27:22 40:2 41:1	125:16,17,19	granted 14:11,21
100:19,21 114:3	131:13 133:22	43:5 44:3,10,20	126:3,24 127:6,24	164:4 181:1 198:2
196:16	135:12 164:6	45:13 55:4 58:20	128:17 129:15	203:14
format 56:8	195:8 206:9	63:8,11 71:16	131:13,22 132:12	granular 81:19
former 12:11 140:7	furtherance 187:21	76:23 79:5 87:3	132:21 133:1,2	gravely 193:8
formulation 135:23	187:25 188:3	88:5 93:2 96:6	136:16,17 141:15	gravity 186:11
forth 8:21 56:11	189:5	99:6 104:17	147:24 152:25	great 43:13 75:6
60:16 102:17	fuss 156:1	105:20 114:10	153:9,18,19	189:25 204:19
206:8	<b>FVC</b> 86:14,15	118:15 120:16	155:22 156:12,25	205:2,2
forward 15:19		128:17,21 130:10	157:17 158:3,10	greater 23:2
16:20 29:21 64:2	<u>G</u>	134:11 148:14	158:19 159:16,18	grips 181:12
94:8 125:2 127:21	gain 96:22	156:5 157:24	159:22 160:10,12	ground 11:12 16:17
134:11 141:24	game 35:5,7	158:19 162:16	161:21,24 162:3	19:19 154:12
142:2 164:21	games 42:10 165:16	164:25 173:24	162:11 163:18	<b>Groundhog</b> 16:3
186:8	gander 8:18 59:21	176:7 182:11	165:2 169:14	26:21 60:1
found 19:6 95:23	115:4 116:13	184:4 186:23	174:18,22 175:11	grounds 115:10
112:11,13,16	Gene 4:13 64:1	194:2 202:21	176:22 177:2,4,7	140:3 141:25
142:14 150:9 178:8	<b>general</b> 104:21 126:20 127:2	goes 30:16 110:21	177:16,18 178:4,6 178:6,7,10,11,16	175:17
four 39:22 95:23	135:6 150:15	139:1 144:14 155:8 162:14	178:0,7,10,11,16	<b>group</b> 30:24 32:16 87:19,20,20
129:5 142:7 189:9				
	<b>generally</b> 130:9 143:20 155:12	169:2 186:7 189:9	179:18,20,21	grouping 30:22 grow 42:21
192:2	143.20 133.12	192:2 195:8	180:6 181:3,4,22	g10W 42.21
	I	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	1

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 217 of 233 PageID: 48252

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

				Page 216
		I	I	I
<b>grown</b> 43:7	<b>Harry</b> 2:5 4:9	51:11	160:19,23 161:18	154:21 172:6
guess 28:23 88:21	hat 190:24	<b>hit</b> 29:19	162:1,9 169:9	175:19 179:14
89:7 111:1 178:21	hate 156:14	hits 141:13	175:11,20 176:10	189:6 191:2
197:13	head 68:15 97:21	hold 52:20 186:20	177:1,10 179:10	identifying 129:19
guessed 124:13	118:17	187:10 195:20,23	179:15 180:6,10	187:24
guidance 166:7	heading 60:18	195:24	181:6,22 182:14	identity 6:12 7:14
guy 121:22 144:11	heads 28:3	holes 73:22	182:25 184:21	65:9 91:9 129:6
154:17 157:12	heap 35:24	Holley 37:4	185:15,19 187:3	ignore 19:12,13
204:19 205:2	hear 77:15 187:6	Holley's 26:1 37:8	187:14,19 188:7	183:12
guys 64:3 79:20	heard 13:20 60:2,5	holy 42:11	188:13 191:6,15	ignored 19:13
101:8 102:4	60:9,15,20 61:20	home 40:23 99:24	192:4,14,24	illustrate 64:21
116:15 120:15	65:16 67:22 69:13	honest 14:4	193:22,25 194:1	66:18
156:5 168:13	73:5 116:4 149:13	honestly 174:7	194:18 195:7	<b>ILO</b> 84:24 85:3,3
188:24 202:3	152:11,14 164:23	honor 5:3,8,13	196:5,15 198:8,11	image 118:17
guys' 156:15	177:1,22 191:6	22:21 23:15 26:9	199:10,13 200:9	imagine 168:18
	197:19 202:7	26:20 27:24 28:9	Honor's 77:15 83:18	importance 11:9
H	hearing 26:22 64:17	28:13 34:1 37:22	96:24 127:20,21	important 10:19
<b>Haines</b> 191:1	69:1 107:11	39:4,9 40:10,16	150:24 152:15	19:24 48:21 52:17
192:16	127:21 138:20	41:4 47:14 48:13	hope 42:7 72:11	52:18 69:25 84:25
half 48:10,15 68:8	164:22 176:11,14	48:19 50:17 51:9	158:11 177:6,7	156:2 177:12
71:16 142:23	187:19 190:23	52:3,22 59:18,22	hopefully 71:24	184:2,3
hand 47:12 54:25	hearings 150:24	60:8 62:17 63:1	158:9	importantly 70:19
190:20,22	hearsay 136:8	64:24 65:13 68:25	horrible 81:7	191:21 203:5
hand-in-hand 49:5	heart 30:16 74:5,8	69:13,23 70:7	horse 166:12,13	impose 54:5
handed 58:11	158:11 184:4,11	71:5 74:12,22	hospital 21:12	imposed 61:3
handle 16:21 166:12	196:24	77:7 78:25 79:13	hour 60:3	imposing 72:25
190:11	hearts 158:11	81:9,25 82:9,11	hours 48:10 194:22	improper 32:17
handled 71:25	heavy 73:18	82:18 85:1,22	195:2	impugn 51:15
166:18 197:25	heels 34:21	87:9,23 89:5,16	housekeeping	impugned 48:25
handling 167:19	Heimlich 77:1	89:21 94:11,13,23	199:21	in-house 5:14
happen 56:20 74:20	held 194:4	95:7 96:9,10,14	How's 189:11	inadequacy 103:20
74:24 79:11 157:5	help 17:16 22:10	97:5,18 99:11	huge 155:12 205:1	inapplicable 7:8
158:10 177:23	36:24 78:10,13	100:5 101:4	human 56:8 205:3	inappropriate
181:5 204:10	93:5 115:13 166:9	105:18 106:18	hundred 118:14	165:21
happened 44:4	194:19	107:10 108:7,12	193:20	include 64:11 74:14
116:7,10 133:3	helped 40:24	109:25 110:10,12	hundreds 81:16	89:13,15 98:19
135:18,18,20	helpful 60:17 63:24	111:3,5,19 112:22	112:11 121:5	included 29:13
136:5,24 140:24	105:2 126:18,19	113:6,23 114:3,21	hurt 38:2 157:19	includes 20:6,18
143:22 154:16	174:7	117:1,9,15 118:9	husband 143:22	including 12:11
159:3 204:25	helps 80:25	118:23 119:6,25	husband's 131:18	36:22 42:9 47:10
happening 102:14	hereinbefore 206:8	121:12 122:7,13	hydrogen 77:11	67:9 109:11 177:1
happens 94:3	herring 112:6	122:17,25 123:3	103:17	193:12
158:12	hesitate 169:8	123:16 124:4,12	105.17	incomplete 22:13
happy 4:2 27:21	hesitation 111:2,12	127:18 129:1	I	inconceivable 74:13
54:25 62:16 71:8	Hey 70:3	130:2,10 132:3,20	ID 85:16,23	inconsistent 75:10
78:24 102:15	high 17:21	134:2,18 135:22	idea 39:13 50:12	incorporate 152:16
117:4 130:10	<b>highlight</b> 79:17,19	136:17 138:9,24	identical 109:4	incorporates 7:20
132:3 159:12,13	118:23	141:10 144:7,12	115:10	incorporation 57:23
hard 22:5 30:13,14	highlighted 82:20	145:1 146:10	identified 59:22	incredibly 130:1
58:24 120:12	highlighter 79:18	147:7,20,24	78:20 117:10	independent 35:10
128:18,21 142:15	81:6	147.7,20,24 149:11,21,25	131:7	35:12 50:4 51:6
162:24 177:9	Hill 1:16	150:8,16,18	identifiers 6:22	indicate 146:19
hard-working 197:2	hills 34:21	151:24 153:1,12	identifies 180:19	200:8
harm 65:21 109:9	hired 135:3	151.24 155.1,12	identify 58:17 69:8	indicated 86:21
109:13,14,15,16	history 21:14,15	157:4,14 159:13	94:24 138:3	indicia 85:6
107.13,14,13,10	1113101 y 41.14,13	137.4,14 137.13	77.27 130.3	muicia 03.0
	<u> </u>	I	I	I

## Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 218 of 233 PageID: 48253

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

				Page 217
individual 15:2 25:1	152:5,8,18 153:13	151:25 155:9,12	183:13,14 185:18	
25:5 94:25 95:11	154:2,15,20,21	151.25 155.9,12	187:15 191:4	K
95:15 106:25		158:18,20,21		Kansas 93:2
107:18 111:8	155:5,5,24,25		198:20,21 199:8 204:15	keep 48:8 52:24
170:25	157:3 167:16	159:15,21 160:2	issued 73:4 109:6	64:10 74:2 120:15
	190:3 199:15	interrogatory		keeps 116:21
individuals 129:6	informed 134:5	101:18,24 103:8	issues 10:7 15:2	kept 205:5
129:19 134:24	infringe 16:16	104:1,7,11,23,25	19:7 29:23 36:18	key 26:23 64:14
135:1 140:10	ingrained 97:20	105:3,7 106:23,24	41:20,21 66:2	66:4 75:9 139:20
information 7:9 8:4	initial 8:22 107:8	107:25 108:18	69:24 71:1,20	kick 177:5
8:5 10:3,10,12,14	149:16 176:1	109:8,23 111:21	75:9 126:6 143:24 144:20 166:11,15	kidding 108:7
10:21,23 11:4,7	initially 105:21	111:23 119:12	,	Kimberlee 1:3
11:15,18 12:1,11	112:7	127:19 128:20,22	183:3 186:3	109:3 140:11
13:13,16 15:2,9	inject 170:24	130:4 131:5 139:9	197:23	143:3
17:24 19:4 20:2,3	injury 66:17 98:6	139:17,18 142:24	iteration 34:7	kind 18:6 19:20
20:4,19 21:1,25	98:22	144:21 145:2,5,6	J	29:21 35:21 51:7
23:23 24:25 25:10	ink 112:15	145:8,10,15,19		54:23 58:1 81:20
26:16 27:25 29:15	inked 119:15	146:1,7 147:10,12	J 1:12 206:4,18 James 2:18	96:23 125:12
29:22 31:1 34:15	input 9:23	148:24 149:2,21		128:3 150:12,18
37:12,23 44:12	inquiries 133:23	154:7,14 155:2	January 1:8 8:16	167:17 174:17
45:22 46:1,9	inquiry 26:23 89:8	159:17,18 160:3	103:1 104:4,17	181:6,13 200:7,22
51:10,17 52:16	instance 40:5	interrupting 52:25	105:23,24 109:24	kindly 83:16 103:3
53:12,14,22 54:2	113:13 118:19	intimately 43:11	128:1 164:11	kinds 155:20
54:7,10,13 56:4	167:10,22 186:11	invade 29:23	165:14,15 166:1	King 4:2
56:11 57:6,11,18	instructions 159:1	investigation 134:5	171:12 206:19	Kirkland 2:7 3:2
57:20,25 58:1,7	insulated 168:12	135:2 150:22	Jersey 1:1,24 60:13	29:9,14 123:21
58:18 61:15,19,23	intend 93:2 108:21	invitation 73:24	161:7 181:1 185:9	136:16
62:2 64:11,23	120:3 199:4,7	involuntary 98:13	<b>job</b> 25:8 34:20 75:6	<b>kitchen</b> 126:21
65:5,7,23 67:3,8	<b>intended</b> 163:23	involved 20:6 31:18	133:23	knew 8:10 174:16
67:24 68:1,9,11	164:8,9	44:3 116:20 130:6	John 3:11 4:23	knock 106:21
69:2,4,10,18,21	interest 37:14	130:15,24 131:17	37:19,20	know 12:14,20
70:5,9 71:14,17	interested 174:11	143:20,20 182:17	join 166:5	14:23 18:8,9
75:14 79:11 81:20	206:13	Ironstone 1:23	jokingly 184:8	31:15 37:8,16,16
86:18 88:23 89:24	interface 12:1	irrelevant 7:9 38:15	joy 99:14	37:17 38:11,12
91:16 93:1,9,14	interloper 13:25	200:23	judge 31:6 33:7	39:3,5,10,19
93:15 99:22 102:8	interlopers 6:19	Irving 115:22 119:4	40:12,14,15,21	41:16,22 44:4
102:11 104:2,5,8	internal 11:6 54:12	141:16 193:18	41:1 55:18 60:7	46:5,5,23 47:14
104:11 106:16	58:8	issue 24:1 27:13	77:4 78:2 100:17	58:6 59:8 63:13
107:4,8,22 108:20	interposed 183:7	28:4,16 39:3	120:19 137:20,21	68:4,8 72:2,8
112:9 113:25	interrogatories 28:8	43:10 45:3,19	139:24 142:15	73:15 74:22,24
114:7,15 122:7	28:11,17 77:13	53:11 55:23 70:15	144:3 168:25	77:12,24 79:25
123:17,21,23,23	99:7,9 100:8,9,11	72:18 76:2,6,23	169:2 185:14	80:25 85:16,22
123:25 124:1,3	100:14,24 101:1	79:8 91:9 95:10	204:23	86:8 87:20 89:17
130:17 131:1,3,4	101:11 102:6,7,24	100:8 106:16	judges 127:1	91:1 95:7,24
131:10,14,16,21	103:5,6,10,13	107:1,1,10 108:13	judgment 25:11	96:15,21 97:20
131:23 134:20	104:7,10,15,20	112:1,5 114:21	44:19 121:17	105:17 109:25
135:13,23 136:9	105:11,22,25	117:3 118:19	judiciary 166:16	114:14,22 115:23
137:4 138:5	109:2 110:18	119:17 123:11	<b>jump</b> 93:24 123:8 175:8	116:21 118:10
139:11 140:2,6,8	111:8,16 121:25	124:20 125:6		119:5,21,22
140:13 141:7	122:1,10,11 125:9	139:20 142:12	Justice 203:17,20	122:24 123:20
142:3,7 144:15,20	125:12 126:2	145:18 149:13	203:25	124:6,10,15,16,25
146:4,17,18 147:1	127:9,23 128:12	150:1 160:9 161:5	Justices 202:21	125:18 127:2
147:14 148:1,2,16	128:14,15,20,23	161:5 169:17,20	justifiably 132:9	130:7,23 132:9,10
148:21 149:22,24	129:5 130:21	170:23 171:3,7,9	justify 31:20 91:15	132:17,23 133:1
150:3,4,21 151:2	134:23 135:5,13	171:10,12 172:17	<b>Justin</b> 2:22 5:9	133:16,25 134:15
151:13,15,24	144:23 145:1	174:18 182:15,25		134:24 135:17,18
	<u> </u>	l	I	I

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 219 of 233 PageID: 48254

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

				Page 218
			1	I
135:25 136:3,3,4	lateral 80:24 117:23	64:20 65:3 80:3	<b>Listen</b> 124:17	182:11 185:18
136:23 137:6	117:25	81:21 99:6 116:24	186:14	201:20,23 205:6
140:12 141:6	laundry 202:4	117:13 118:15	listening 130:19	longer 99:12 198:2
142:10 144:6,8,9	law 1:11 10:11 11:3	120:15 129:25	182:11	look 10:19 22:5 32:2
144:11 147:15	15:14 17:8,9,18	130:11 152:18	lists 104:20	39:5,22,23 41:17
148:5,9,12 149:8	17:23 18:4 30:16	155:24 157:20	litany 25:2 135:14	56:7,9 57:1 76:9
150:9,10,15,21,23	38:16 45:16 54:13	158:15 189:16	literally 34:21	77:23 79:16 84:1
151:11,20 153:14	60:14 77:3 103:21	<b>letter</b> 164:11 165:1	litigate 45:15	114:10 118:2
153:24 155:4,21	146:20 155:11	165:16 166:1	litigating 185:17	127:21 128:18,21
156:14,14,24	167:11 175:13	171:12 187:1	litigation 2:24 5:18	132:1,3 143:8,15
157:20 161:4,21	181:13 182:21	201:21 204:23	11:4 12:21 44:1	146:2 158:19
161:23 162:12,20	197:10 202:21	<b>letters</b> 20:10 86:4,8	53:24 56:1 58:9	166:24 167:23
163:6 167:25	Law's 187:20	162:23	64:10 67:21 70:16	172:7,8,9,11
172:22 173:3,5	laws 176:16	<b>letting</b> 122:19	75:21,21 92:20	173:25 174:10
174:3,23 175:6,15	lawsuit 11:1 24:13	<b>LEVY</b> 2:15	98:7	175:12 176:8
181:1 182:8	53:18 73:22 98:7	liberality 198:1	<b>Litner</b> 40:14,21	185:25 191:17
183:21 184:16	98:13,17 116:20	lie 135:11	41:1	199:7
185:6 187:14	124:1,9 126:11	lied 98:1	<b>Litner's</b> 40:12	looked 17:21 30:13
190:3,13,16,22	147:5	lien 87:13,13,13,16	little 2:16 4:18,18	30:14 34:8 54:23
191:9,18 193:11	lawsuits 24:9 141:2	89:3 91:5	4:21 5:22 6:3 9:1	81:18
193:14,17 196:23	lawyer 30:15 38:5	lies 154:24	9:3,5,8,21 11:20	looking 36:21,21
197:7 198:13	38:22 43:12 56:18	life 82:24 182:20	12:7,19 13:2,4	39:22 55:3 67:18
200:1,12 201:10	56:20,22 57:10	<b>lifted</b> 179:2	14:6 16:2 35:3	95:21 142:22
201:16,25 202:14	65:22 133:3	<b>lifts</b> 179:6	42:22 47:5 48:16	143:8,9,11,16
202:18 204:11	136:15 137:11	Liggett 191:1	48:19 49:7,18,21	146:13 156:3
knowing 75:1 79:7	144:15 148:14,19	192:16	50:1 51:8,9,25	159:11 169:6
151:1 174:16	153:19 157:25	likes 80:23	52:5,24 53:1 55:1	170:24 191:7
knowledge 35:2	158:1,6 184:9	likewise 8:20	55:5,7,16,20 56:5	looks 15:6 184:13
130:14 134:12,18	203:6 205:3	limit 12:20 54:5	56:16 57:3,14,17	<b>Lord</b> 116:15
146:3,17 148:2	lawyer's 155:13	198:3	58:14,22 59:1,5,8	lose 198:6
153:18,25 154:1	lawyers 7:15 30:22	limitation 164:1	59:12 65:4 66:13	loss 109:12,14,15,16
154:18	31:13 32:16 43:13	198:6	79:4 99:9,11,15	205:1,3
known 27:9 34:17	61:9 114:14 131:8	limitations 8:2 61:3	99:18,21,25 100:5	losses 109:9
45:2 46:22	131:22 134:4,5	limited 13:15 28:20	117:25 133:22	lost 33:23 129:13
knows 29:1 142:16	135:3 146:22	41:20 55:13 72:12	148:4 153:5	197:13
151:4 152:16	147:4 184:5,23	94:2 99:1 109:12	164:20 166:14	lot 17:25 41:3 52:15
155:23 180:11	197:11 200:24	115:5 162:13	182:15 185:6	88:5 96:20 100:22
KONIGSBERG	202:22 203:5	174:22 178:13	186:10 200:23	126:18 167:20
2:15	204:13	limits 197:4	202:18	174:6 178:22
Kozlov 6:1 163:20	lay 73:24 77:7 130:6	Linares 40:15 55:18	live 61:13 119:18	193:19 205:8
167:14 174:22	learn 124:25 156:20	60:7 78:2 100:17	163:6 179:11	love 195:25
	learned 115:22	120:19 137:20,21	Livingston 2:12	low 17:22
L	135:1 155:11	142:15 144:4	LLC 1:6 2:10,20,22	LP 3:6
laid 94:23 168:23	learning 113:13	Linares' 139:24	2:25 3:4	LPA 2:17
Lake 1:15	leave 180:24	169:2	<b>LLP</b> 1:14 2:7,11,15	LSAT 77:10
language 53:20,25	leaves 67:12 91:8	<b>Lincoln</b> 186:2	3:2	luck 73:9
92:18 126:17	left 23:18 71:13	197:22	location 84:18 90:13	lung 70:12 86:15,16
152:8	174:15	line 41:6 131:14	90:15	Luther 4:2
lap 40:24	lefthand 55:3,4	157:9	log 173:24 174:1	
large 34:22 77:8	legal 34:16	lines 70:24	175:20	M
162:13 197:24	legitimate 120:24	list 21:13,16,17	logistics 200:4	<b>M</b> 2:4,5
201:2	125:25 127:12	22:18 79:6,17,18	long 16:6 41:6 43:1	machine 63:17
largely 10:22	length 197:19	81:5 144:14	77:20,20 107:23	magistrate 168:25
lasted 115:9	let's 14:25 30:11	145:24 156:6	145:24 162:5	magnitude 184:24
late 202:10	31:21 37:3 38:4	165:22,23 190:12	163:2 176:20	maintains 11:3
	31.21 37.3 30.7	100.22,20 170.12	103.2 170.20	
	1	1	1	1

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 220 of 233 PageID: 48255

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

				Page 219
1. 1.5 0 1.50 -	60.5.10.10.00	150 15 150 10 50	1 20 10 10 17 17 5	100.04
maker 167:9 168:7	63:5,10,19,23	152:17 153:4,9,20	38:12 40:15 45:25	mere 123:24
making 22:1 38:20	64:3 67:15 68:5	153:23 154:4,9,19	46:24 50:8 56:17	merits 10:6 45:10
48:8 130:15,25	68:14,19,22 70:22	154:23 155:1	72:15 85:21 97:14	mesothelioma 70:11
131:17 143:21	71:9,23 74:8,19	156:10,13 157:11	99:13 108:25	messes 168:21
183:18	75:13,16,19 76:1	157:15 159:14	110:3,15 112:15	met 9:16 66:12
malpractice 51:1	76:5,16,22,25	160:16,21 161:2,6	129:25 167:24	69:19 164:17,20
mandate 103:16	77:3,21,25 78:9	161:11,16,20,23	180:15	method 101:19
mandatory 53:20	78:23 79:1,15	162:2,7,10 163:2	meaning 68:15	109:13 155:18
53:25	80:12,21 81:4,14	163:5,16 168:5,19	138:4 197:13	methodology 73:8
manipulated 75:14	81:17,23 82:3,23	168:20 169:1,4,10	meaningful 108:19	73:10
manufacturer	83:1,4,7,14,21,25	169:13,18,21	125:9 126:14	Michael 2:5 4:7
134:10	84:6,10,23 85:2,7	170:3,6,9,14	meaningless 117:18	micrographs 113:11
MARINO 3:9	85:11,20,24 86:24	171:1,8,11,15,20	means 16:5 30:3	Microsoft 11:23
mark 159:9	87:3,10,16,24	171:25 172:18,24	46:6 85:16 89:9	mid 202:10
marked 116:5 128:3	88:8,11,17 89:6	173:1,4,9,13,16	91:1 121:21	middle 88:6 120:10
Market 1:11 2:3	89:12,18 90:1,4	174:4,6,11,19	133:21 135:9	military 21:15 89:6
markings 85:6	91:7 93:5,17,21	175:2,8,22 176:1	146:15 197:4,5	89:8 90:4,12,13
married 184:9,10	93:24 94:14 95:4	176:9,13,22 177:6	meant 8:10 122:16	90:15,17
Martin 4:2	95:24 97:3,6,13	177:11,16,21	measly 44:25	mill 34:19
mass 88:13	97:16,19 98:1	179:6,9,20,25	measure 197:24	MILLER 2:20
master 1:17 4:1,20	99:13,17,19,22	180:3,8,14 182:1	mechanism 168:15	milquetoast 27:13
4:25 5:4,7,10,15	100:2,7 101:5,8	182:5,8 183:5,22	Medford 1:24	mind 26:24
5:19 9:6,17 11:16	106:1,5,13 107:24	183:24 184:1	medical 10:24 20:11	mindful 150:17,23
12:3,17,22 13:3	108:2,5,9,14,17	185:23 187:4,8	21:24 31:23 32:11	mine 80:23
13:17,23 14:1,4	108:23 109:1,6	188:9,17,20,23	33:20,24 34:8	minimum 69:15
14:11 16:1,9,12	110:2,5,7,14	189:8,14,16,19	35:11,12 37:4	156:1
17:4,11,14,16	111:10,13,20	190:5,9,18 191:11	39:8,16 49:15	ministerial 161:16
18:7,16,21 19:12	112:18,24 113:3,8	191:17,21,24	87:1	162:3
20:24 21:6,8 22:9	113:20 114:16,22	192:7,10,21 193:4	medicals 33:11,18	minor 94:12 185:14
23:1,11,21 24:3,5	115:13,17,20	193:7,10,15,20	33:19,25 34:2	minute 39:21 52:21
24:9,13,17,23	117:5,23 118:2,6	194:7,10,14,19	Medicare 87:12,13	64:8 189:17
25:6,18 26:4,10	118:10,13 119:2	195:2,5,14,18,24	87:13,16,17,17,18	minutes 156:6
27:3,8 28:7,10,14	119:21 120:2	196:3,6,17,23	87:24 88:1 91:5	188:15
28:19,22 29:2,19	121:21 122:4,9,15	197:3,7,10,20	meds 88:2	misconception
30:1,6,9,18 31:9	122:18,21 123:4,7	198:12,18 199:17	meet 9:13 13:7	79:14
31:16 32:4,7,14	123:10,13,19,22	199:20,24 200:11	51:21 82:10 95:10	misread 151:12
33:2,4,6,9,14 34:4	123:10,13,19,22	200:21 202:7,12	95:12 96:9 159:11	misrepresentation
35:15,19 37:10,15	124.10,10,23	200.21 202.7,12 202:16 203:19,24	member 15:11,13	133:7
37:24 38:3,7,14	129:2,7,12,20,24	202:10 203:19,24 204:11,19 205:1,9	15:14,15	missing 118:21
38:25 39:18 40:14	130:3,18 132:16	master's 165:8	members 14:10,16	missing 116.21 misstep 185:7,14
40:17,20 41:9	130:5,18 132:16	178:25	14:17,20,20,22	mistake 18:11
The state of the s				
43:3,17,21 44:6	133:14 134:13	material 60:3	15:9 19:4 21:15	misunderstanding
44:14 46:17,20	136:11 137:1,9,12	200:25	55:17 82:14 93:11	13:5 76:13
47:1,4,10,18,25	137:18,21,25	materials 199:7	96:12,25 138:13	modern 11:4
48:4,14 49:2,10	138:6,11,16,21	matter 18:22 55:9	members' 89:23	modify 55:8 79:21
49:20,23 50:2,7	139:5,12 140:14	71:25 73:4 78:6	memo 85:20 202:22	79:22
50:10,13,16,24	140:17 141:1,8,11	79:15 87:1 182:17	202:25	moment 16:2,3
51:7,22 52:4,9,11	141:18,21 142:5	182:19 202:16	memorandum 11:6	17:14 63:15 126:4
52:15,23 54:21	142:20,25 143:5,7	205:11	58:2 197:17	135:7 175:23
55:2,6,15,18 56:5	143:11,14,18,25	matters 39:6 66:9	memory 136:20,22	190:19 203:9
56:17 57:12,15	144:3,8,13 145:9	78:4	163:25	<b>Monday</b> 1:8 181:10
58:10,16,24 59:4	146:5,8,11 147:16	McGuire 204:17	mention 190:2	Montalto 2:24 5:13
59:7,10,14,24	147:21 148:3	mean 7:20 9:11,21	mentioned 29:5,7	5:14,17,18
60:12 61:8,25	149:18 150:2	10:10 11:3 20:24	48:22 65:14 186:1	month 108:19
62:4,6,11,14 63:2	151:6,10,17,19	30:2 31:4,18	193:23	122:12 160:5
L				

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 221 of 233 PageID: 48256

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

				Page 220
months 42:19 60:4	75:20,21	192:13	105:13 106:23	occur 42:6 96:7
71:16 95:23	nature 7:16 53:15	non-answers 103:2	108:18 109:8,23	107:5
107:15 111:18	110:13	non-bankruptcy	111:21,23 117:17	occurred 105:15
113:14 179:16	Navy 90:23	67:14 69:5	117:21 118:25	107:7 115:14,15
180:1 203:8	near 184:11	non-filer 24:3	127:19 128:20,22	115:17
moot 71:1 102:24	necessarily 39:19	non-filers 24:1	129:6,18,22,22,23	occurs 35:21
morning 4:1 5:8,10	49:18,20 142:5	non-garbled 27:16	129:23,24,25	October 7:7 8:14
59:19 60:21 65:16	149:4	non-malignant	130:3 131:5	16:5 26:21 69:1
67:23 69:14	necessary 20:1 21:1	70:14 71:7,21	137:24,25 138:1	100:10 107:11
140:23 156:4	202:2,4	84:25 86:11,20	139:14,17 140:18	138:19 176:11
moss 43:7	need 9:15,23 10:4	non-parties 55:25	141:12 143:6,10	odd 172:19
motion 5:25 6:4,8	25:11,12 60:14	105:14	143:17 144:24	offer 19:18
6:18 7:16,23	63:13 70:9,9	non-party 17:23	145:5,11,19	offered 9:13
25:15 41:11 42:3	71:16 72:5 78:11	38:22 54:17	147:12 159:17,19	office 200:18,19,22
42:5 55:7,24,24	78:13 93:5 94:9	non-privileged	160:3 165:17	202:21,23
70:10,24 76:18	114:7 116:22	199:15	166:25,25 167:9	<b>OFFICER</b> 206:1
99:6,8 101:15	120:6,6,16 124:25	non-proportional	174:23 178:5,7	offices 1:11
102:12,23 103:19	126:4 127:8	163:7	numbering 139:16	oh 63:8 95:22 98:3
103:22,25 105:16	152:13 156:14	non-settlement	numbers 6:23 22:10	118:13 125:5
106:3,11 107:2,21	157:11 158:13	34:10	88:12 129:21	129:2 163:16
110:22 117:14	159:19 160:7	non-substantive	139:5	187:6 202:12
121:16 122:8	169:18 172:4,7	128:9	numerous 50:5	Ohio 7:8 44:11
158:18 159:24	182:17 186:15,24	non-talc 69:5	NY 2:16	66:15,22 160:19
163:19 174:20	187:4,8,9 191:22	nonexistent 117:18	111 2.10	161:3
182:24 184:24	202:3 204:13,14	normally 8:24 77:22	0	okay 4:20,21 5:19
186:4,11 202:8,25	204:14	167:3,4 168:6	o'clock 194:21	12:3 13:3,17,19
motions 5:22 20:14	needed 40:25 156:5	200:16,18 203:19	oath 152:24	16:3,9 18:9 19:13
202:18,19,23	204:21	note 105:21 111:15	object 127:11,11	21:7 23:1,13,21
mouths 150:20	needing 71:13	140:4 157:17	141:24 194:10,16	24:17,23 25:6,18
movant 8:24	needs 22:2 42:6	158:17	objected 82:11	27:8,18 28:22
move 8:24 15:19	68:10 73:1 119:18	<b>noted</b> 64:7 106:18	objecting 164:12	29:2 30:9 35:22
16:19 49:17 72:14	140:10,10 141:3	163:22	objection 41:14	37:16,18 40:2,7
73:1,12 106:6	negotiate 74:17	notes 48:8,9 83:8,8	127:12,14,14,15	40:17 41:2 42:20
123:12 125:1	neighborhood 97:7	164:25 206:7	135:6 141:24	43:14 44:4,6,17
moved 106:5 157:8	neither 64:22 91:2	nothing's 42:14	142:1 162:6 183:6	45:25 46:17 47:1
moves 175:16	206:9,11	notice 115:9 126:5	objections 7:21	47:4,10 48:14
179:13	net 12:3 79:22	141:21	104:21 126:21	49:20 50:7,16,22
moving 74:2 78:1	never 12:25 16:16	<b>noticed</b> 162:20	127:2 158:7	52:4,20 53:1 55:6
94:7	24:4,5 32:3 82:17	notion 35:24 75:10	objectively 184:13	58:16 59:7,14,16
<b>multiple</b> 60:7 61:22	114:22 157:13	144:17,19	obligation 42:11	61:8,10,25 63:2
64:5 74:11	158:12 171:10	November 82:8	127:10 134:14	64:3 71:12 74:22
0.10 / 1111	177:7	100:11 111:17	150:25 155:9	75:2,9 76:5,19,25
N	new 1:1,24 2:16	NS 83:20,21	175:19 176:18	78:1,2,4,23 79:7
N.W 2:8 3:3,6	60:13 68:8 161:6	number 6:9,15,24	200:24	79:19 80:19 81:4
name 5:16 20:22	161:13 162:18	7:2,18 8:15 14:13	obligations 46:8	81:14 82:3,23
39:24 84:4,7	181:1 185:9	20:21 22:15,17,23	127:4	83:3,6 84:1,10,15
90:18,20,24,25	Newark 2:21,21	23:16,17,19,20	<b>obliged</b> 126:13	85:2,7,11,20,24
137:7,12 156:12	nice 40:22 162:23	24:21 27:9 47:17	133:18	86:24 87:3,10,24
named 55:11 104:24	162:25 163:6	77:8 79:14,16	obtained 146:18	88:11,17,18 89:12
109:7,22 110:17	164:15	85:8,9,10,12	obviously 59:3	90:3 91:7 95:13
160:22	<b>night</b> 180:13 181:7	88:10,20 90:20	110:4 139:20	97:13 98:23 101:5
names 12:24 22:19	<b>NJ</b> 1:16 2:12,21	94:21 97:20	183:2 203:9	101:7 106:13,15
Nancy 52:11	3:10	101:24 102:17	occupation 84:20	107:24 110:2,5,17
narrow 58:19	Nobody's 31:9	103:8 104:1,7,24	occupy 158:14	111:10 112:18
<b>National</b> 45:3 70:15	non-advocacy	105:1,3,3,6,7,10	168:7	114:18 115:17,20
		100.1,0,0,0,7,10		110113.17,20
	l	l	I	I

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

115:24 117:24	oppose 165:12	119:8,15 121:1	papers 117:2	passive 128:10
120:7 121:22	opposed 57:9 65:6	127:23 135:20		
			paragraph 54:4	patience 13:20
122:9,23 123:7,10	95:2,21 119:15	157:7 163:10,13	97:21 146:15	patient 27:19 48:16
123:13 125:3,14	169:9 189:6	originally 111:16	147:25	51:8
126:6 127:22	opposes 166:4	originals 102:1,2,2	parallel 170:6	patiently 83:10
128:20 129:22,24	opposing 157:18	112:14,14 113:1,7	parameters 75:23	patients 39:23
130:3,18 132:17	<b>opposition</b> 7:1,3,19	113:9,19 114:11	paraphrased	pattern 40:3,6 46:5
137:1,9,22 138:6	70:1 102:20 106:9	116:9 117:4,12	186:18	paying 44:24 69:3,6
139:12 140:14,17	163:19,24 165:16	119:10	Park 1:15	<b>payment</b> 6:14 47:6
141:8,12 142:20	165:23 166:5,6,21	ought 32:24 35:2	part 8:5 12:12,18,21	92:2,5,8
143:14,18,23	177:23 179:21	121:9 152:20	12:25,25 19:24	payments 91:11
144:13 146:8	180:6,9,22 186:24	197:5	31:8 48:24 51:20	PC 2:2 3:9
148:5 151:6 152:3	189:10 192:2	outlined 94:16	54:11,21 75:2	<b>PD</b> 87:5,7,18
153:22 154:3,25	201:1,15	output 12:8	77:9 96:11 97:2	Pease 52:11 105:13
157:23 159:14	oppositions 102:18	outside 189:9 190:3	108:12 111:7	pendency 25:14
160:16 161:11	opt 15:12 56:1	192:2	112:22 124:13	pending 29:11
162:9 163:4 168:6	optimistically 156:7	over-thinking	129:15 156:8	92:20 202:8,9
169:12,21 171:1	option 12:8	182:15	186:24 194:6	pens 116:17
171:20,25 173:1	<b>Oral</b> 1:10	overarching 155:23	196:2 200:9 201:6	people 12:24 15:3
173:16 174:4,8,19	oranges 147:24	overboard 190:2	201:9	18:4 24:4,8 27:10
175:2,21 176:9	order 6:4,25 7:25	overdue 107:23	parte 164:9,13	27:12 30:23 33:21
179:9,16,17,18	8:14,23 10:24	overreached 19:22	165:11,20,25	38:2 42:6 46:12
181:15 182:1	15:17,19,25 16:19	overreaching 19:23	167:8 171:13	61:6 74:11,14
185:5 187:6,20,25	17:5,7 22:3,3	overruled 142:1	178:17 186:15	75:24 80:7 90:22
188:8 189:12,13	41:10 45:25 58:21	oversell 75:22	187:5 192:22	97:1,12 114:9
189:16 190:9	60:13 63:12 65:19	overtaken 101:1	195:11	126:1,12,20 130:6
192:10 193:6	65:25 69:11 79:10	Owens 46:13	partially 175:18	130:14 131:7,12
194:7,14 198:17	83:5,9,19 89:19	owned 53:17 54:16	participants 2:19	139:3 141:16
201:2,3,18,22	89:20 91:20,23		3:1 22:15	142:17 151:1
205:10	92:10,15,17 94:8	P	participate 172:4	157:7 163:8
old 42:19,21 73:14	94:10 96:10,24	<b>P</b> 1:17	particular 38:24	201:24 204:4
115:23 141:15,18	100:19,22,25	<b>P-E-A-S-E</b> 52:12	150:14 185:18	people's 29:22
163:8 168:13	102:17,21 104:15	<b>P.C</b> 2:9	203:6	percent 70:12
omelette 148:6	110:4,7,11 127:21	<b>p.m</b> 205:11	particularly 73:19	125:23,24
once 5:20 27:11	169:7 171:5	<b>PA</b> 1:11 2:4	113:25 157:1	perception 136:20
40:21,22 79:24	199:22 200:5	package 49:14	183:15	136:21,22
93:1,14 103:18	204:6	50:22,23	parties 8:5 14:18	percolated 203:7
142:14 165:15	ordered 12:4 18:5	packs 88:24,25	53:13,17 67:2	perfect 197:2
166:12 198:5	45:20 61:6 72:23	page 55:3 70:2 87:4	95:2 105:15 120:2	perfectly 72:24 73:7
204:17	93:12 95:13	88:12 94:18	160:17 164:23	198:9 201:14
one's 92:23	107:22 110:25	143:17 145:24	194:4 206:11	performing 168:12
onerous 30:3	138:9	146:3,5,12 163:25	parties' 14:5 53:11	period 72:13 98:18
ones 63:8,8,11	orders 7:7 30:12	164:3 169:23,24	partly 205:6	permission 15:22
129:17 174:23	73:3 190:1	172:14 187:5	partner's 27:21	16:20,23 99:15
opens 56:3	organization 30:20	198:5	partners 43:23	permit 195:9
operate 98:24 126:9	30:21 85:4	pages 118:21	party 17:9,18 19:2	permitted 15:21
operation 167:11	organized 11:5	142:23,23 164:5	51:10 65:7,11	199:15
operative 12:13	organizing 168:11	171:16 196:18,19	94:24 123:25	peroxide 77:11
opinion 15:23 40:11	original 44:21 84:4	196:20,24 197:13	127:10 166:19	103:17
40:12	101:13,23 104:1	pages' 164:8	168:8 175:16	perpetrated 113:19
opinions 40:23,24	104:12,13 109:18	paid 44:25 87:12,13	176:18 182:18	person 25:1 104:24
opportunity 40:19	111:25 112:5	197:11	party's 127:4	123:14 124:8
55:25 72:5 103:18	113:11,12,17	painfully 34:17	passage 132:6	148:9,10 151:20
177:12,17 180:15	114:1,6,10 115:11	150:3	passed 61:21	153:2 167:15
204:5	116:3,6,10 117:2	paper 116:21 121:6	passion 48:6	168:4 169:8
			_	

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

				1 agc 222
nongonia 00.21	27,0 12 00 20.1 4	6.10 7.2 12 21	60.2 70.12	nowan 97.21 22
person's 98:21	37:2,13,22 38:1,4 38:9 41:12 42:23	6:19 7:3,13,21	60:3 70:12 <b>POA</b> 87:21	power 87:21,22
<b>personal</b> 6:22 66:17 130:17 131:16	42:24 43:9,19	9:22 10:7,16 13:9 22:18 23:24 28:3	point 12:9 14:12,19	powers 185:15 practical 148:4
· ·	44:2,7,16 46:19	36:10,12 55:12	14:23 16:19,19	practice 43:22 46:6
134:18 148:10,11 153:25 154:1	46:22 47:2,9,21	,	21:9 25:7,9,19	49:11
		61:1,11,16 64:9 64:22 67:16 69:6	26:23 28:1,23	49:11 practiced 180:25
personally 141:6 persons 98:3	48:1 49:25 50:2,3 50:9 12 14 18			
persons 98:3 perspective 19:19	50:9,12,14,18 51:4 52:6 62:3,5,7	69:8 70:8 73:18 86:21 91:11,13	29:20 31:14 39:12 48:20 53:2 58:19	practicing 155:11 practitioners 10:24
36:20	62:8 65:20 67:23	92:2,12 93:16	60:2,11 61:15	pre-certification
pertaining 131:17	68:6,10,17,20,23	94:9 100:14 101:2	66:4 69:22,22	103:21
peruse 13:10	69:14 71:6 74:12	102:20 103:5,16	71:5 75:5 79:13	precedent 92:24
Peter 2:9 4:11	76:15 80:10,13,19	103:23 106:6	81:10 94:13 96:8	preclude 70:4
PFT 85:24 86:1,13	81:1,2 86:22,25	107:11 109:7,23	105:25 106:8,12	precluded 95:14
PFTs 87:2	92:24 93:6,8,19	110:17,19,20	119:22 123:16	prefer 162:15
phase 196:3,4,6	93:22 94:11 97:10	111:9 112:6,12	124:22 126:10,11	200:11
Philadelphia 1:11	97:22 98:24 99:2	114:10 130:24	127:7,18 145:17	preference 201:12
2:4	114:6 115:7 117:6	131:10 135:21	148:6 162:18	prejudge 177:9
phone 4:22 36:23	119:12,18 121:10	136:2 139:15	165:14 166:23	prejudice 72:4
photomicrographs	121:11 123:8,11	149:15 150:5	170:22 175:7	73:13
115:6	132:25 140:22	157:7 158:19	177:17 178:21	prejudiced 181:3
phrase 117:22	151:7 160:25	160:9,15 164:17	179:11 198:12	preliminary 13:20
physical 86:2,14,14	161:4 164:12	165:10,11,20	201:5,6	premature 14:24
physician 134:9	165:7 168:2	167:22 169:14	pointed 187:19	15:7 103:6,11,14
physicians 43:23	169:17,20,22	plaintiffs' 5:25	pointing 158:2,9	104:6,8 110:12
pick 59:16 75:5	170:5,8,12,16	21:11,13,14,14,15	points 14:13 60:24	prematurely 7:16
<b>picked</b> 193:18	171:2,14,18,21	26:13,24,25 28:24	74:11	prematurity 60:16
<b>picking</b> 48:17 79:5	172:2,22 173:2,8	41:18 48:2 70:1	poke 73:21	107:1
picture 27:24	173:11,15,19	70:23 71:3 72:2	<b>polite</b> 205:7	<b>prepare</b> 58:3 202:24
172:12	174:8,13,25 175:5	89:22 101:12,12	politely 122:19	prepared 58:8
piece 113:14 121:6	176:3 177:22	101:14 104:18	poor 48:9 90:22	111:8 159:8
147:10 174:14	178:4,18 179:4,8	106:9,22,25	198:10	presence 10:25
181:8 193:19	180:19 181:8,24	107:17 108:3	posed 192:5	99:12,14
196:13,15	182:2,6,16,23	115:4 149:16	<b>position</b> 9:10,12	present 1:13 11:25
pieces 70:1	184:23 188:2	163:19 165:5	10:17 11:12 14:8	48:7 70:19 133:25
pierced 168:15	189:3,19,20 190:7	planning 70:8	19:3 36:3,25 48:5	presented 8:20
<b>pile</b> 146:9	190:10,25 194:8	plant 146:25	54:9 59:2 71:6,13	55:23 91:15
pity 198:10	194:12 195:13	play 63:16 64:4	89:16 93:9,10,13	presently 76:2
place 19:17 46:10	197:18 202:9,14	166:15 170:22	105:19 112:13	preserve 93:12
46:11,25 47:3	203:15,22 204:9	179:18 182:23	121:14,15,17	120:3
67:11 130:7	205:10	184:2 186:3	172:19 194:9	pressed 128:19
199:23 206:7	<b>Placitella's</b> 49:11	197:23	195:12	presumably 86:12
Placitella 2:2,4 4:5,5	119:8 175:18	playing 72:10	positions 14:5	86:14 91:4 130:23
5:6 13:17,19,24	176:19 191:8,14	playoff 165:16	<b>possession</b> 136:10	142:1
14:3,8,13 16:2,7	plaintiff 20:19,20	pleadings 20:10	140:6,9 149:23	presume 67:18,19
16:10,18 17:6,13	21:12,21,22,25	please 4:4 5:16	150:4	140:1 199:25
17:15,21 18:14,18	49:14 84:8,12	13:23 21:6 24:18	possessor 167:5	pretending 174:2 pretty 30:13,14 70:5
18:25 19:14 21:4	95:1 105:12 109:3	27:17 83:10	possibility 13:16 possible 12:16,18	70:7 81:18,18,19
21:7,10 23:4,8,25 24:4,7,11,15 25:2	124:5 132:22 145:4,4,20,20	105:17 118:13 158:19,23 162:16	13:2,13 58:15	97:6,14 154:5
25:7,16,20 26:17	149:22 151:25	162:17,25 178:8	75:17 80:6 124:24	166:17 168:22
27:1,4,18 28:5	152:21 159:1	198:9,15	possibly 156:1	171:17 176:17
29:4,16,20 30:4,8	185:11	pled 12:13 97:14	Post 90:25 91:4	178:22 183:16
30:10 31:6,11,17	plaintiff's 31:2	pleu 12.13 97.14 plowed 16:17	potential 15:15	191:8
32:6,8 33:1,3,5,7	plaintiffs 1:4 2:6 4:4	PLRP 87:17,17,18	22:18 23:23 38:2	prevented 95:16
33:10,15 35:7	4:6,8,10 6:14,17	plus 34:24 58:20	38:10 71:19	104:12
55.15,15 55.7	,.,.,.	F1455.121.55.20		102
	•	-	•	•

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

				1 450 223
previous 145:14	180:17 183:11	10:18 11:13 17:9	140:20 145:12,21	purely 183:7
previously 10:14	201:14	17:19,24 18:3	145:23 147:7	purpose 36:16
53:8	problem 34:3	19:5 21:18 29:22	prosecuting 146:19	114:14 120:12
prima 31:19 164:17	problems 104:20	32:12 43:1 53:16	prosecution 105:8	155:24 170:13,16
169:25 170:18	129:18 180:21	53:21 54:16 56:3	147:15	180:21
171:3 172:5 176:5	procedural 160:9	56:6,14,15,19,24	protect 14:9 54:1	purposes 20:17
177:3,8,25 178:2	183:7,11,13,13	57:2,7,13 61:20	91:20 195:11	82:16 132:18
178:3,8 185:22	185:6,14 186:12	66:5 67:6 85:16	protectable 37:12	pursuant 16:25
186:16,22,24	187:15,16,23	85:18,23 134:9	protected 11:13	91:22,23 100:18
187:11,21 188:13	<b>procedure</b> 164:23	157:23	55:9 56:24	push 132:2
193:24 194:2	175:3,11 180:18	<b>production</b> 6:5 7:22	<b>protection</b> 53:16	put 35:23 68:7 77:4
primary 84:18,18	181:25 185:20	7:24 8:2 15:18	54:18,24 92:18	95:8 126:17 129:8
84:21 85:14	proceeding 92:22	28:14 53:6 54:6	protective 8:23	129:12 137:13
print 116:23 142:23	proceedings 170:7	69:9 79:10 91:21	protects 38:16	141:24 142:1
printed 128:2,4	173:17	96:11 155:16	prove 69:17 74:2	150:20 153:20
prior 7:10 8:14 10:1	process 7:5 9:13	products 98:5,10,11	85:17 108:21	154:4,6 173:18
98:6	43:2 51:21 76:8	98:15	proven 36:14	179:20,21 190:23
private 43:22	96:6 139:19	profession 34:17	113:21	201:16 203:11
privately 201:13	145:15 165:5	184:8 205:2	provide 12:15	putative 7:17 14:10
privilege 6:2 11:14	167:2 168:24,25	Professional 46:7	107:22 110:8	14:17,19,22 15:9
15:10,16 19:8	170:25 182:22	professor 197:15	126:14 128:4	15:10,13 19:3
29:23 54:15 66:4	183:8 185:7,8	profitably 80:9	131:10,20 138:5	52:8 55:16 61:5
67:6 92:18 135:7	189:2 195:8,9	81:21	148:15 150:22	70:12 77:9 82:13
137:15 139:25	200:9,16 203:1	<b>Project</b> 45:3 70:16	153:13 157:2	89:23 93:11 96:12
140:2 141:25	processes 28:25	75:22	169:24	96:25 102:8
142:3 148:18	produce 6:20 8:19	pronounce 52:12	<b>provided</b> 10:23 13:9	138:12 139:4
163:21 166:11	12:1,23 17:19	proof 39:14,15	13:9 15:23 45:23	puts 10:12 54:8 83:8
167:1,10,13	21:2 58:6 61:17	176:21 184:9	94:21 100:18	putting 62:15 74:4
173:24 174:1	61:22 62:1,19,21	proofs 132:19	101:2 106:16,17	154:11 177:21
175:17,20 183:4	63:13 64:23 66:23	proper 103:7	107:9,19 127:25	
195:12 199:1,3	75:8,11 79:7,23	<b>properly</b> 32:12 36:2	128:14,16 130:25	Q
privileged 53:15	82:18 83:2,12,16	127:9	138:8 140:10	<b>qualified</b> 6:14 47:6
55:9 56:3,23 57:7	83:19 86:21 89:19	proportional 68:9	144:20 150:6	91:11 92:2,4,8
57:14,15 62:20	101:25 102:1	163:7	155:6 160:4	qualify 47:16
65:12 67:4 142:9	109:21 117:6	proportionality	165:10	quality 84:22,24
143:25 166:22,25	125:16,18,23	68:7	provides 29:15	85:2 114:5
167:1,6,7,9,17	132:22 134:14	proposal 9:21 10:15	165:1	quarrel 152:6
178:14,16 193:3	<b>produced</b> 6:21 7:11	51:20 62:9 178:25	providing 13:4,11	quash 55:8
<b>prize</b> 120:16	9:14 10:24 12:4,5	proposed 5:23	54:23 106:17	quest 89:7,8
<b>probably</b> 18:14 44:9	56:8 62:23 63:6,9	100:19,21,25	169:15	question 30:24 32:5
85:23,25 86:13	63:11 66:22 72:23	102:21	provision 171:13	38:15 47:13 58:25
177:2 200:3	74:18 79:20 80:15	proposing 8:3 72:3	psychiatric 118:15	76:1,2,10,17,17
<b>probate</b> 7:9 87:7,9	80:20 91:25 92:9	178:11	193:21	89:9 108:15,23,24
87:11,11,12,12,25	92:14 94:23	proposition 17:20	<b>public</b> 10:11 170:2	109:1 111:25
88:1	102:11 112:12,23	37:3	175:12 186:20	113:12 124:8,13
probation 201:17	113:5,13 114:11	propounded 100:10	188:12 189:3	152:10,15 160:18
<b>problem</b> 36:5 40:5,7	117:11,20 121:4	100:11 110:18	192:15,25 194:6	160:21 173:5,5
43:16 44:23 46:3	138:10 148:21	111:16 127:9	194:22 199:14	192:5,11
62:25 64:21	150:14	130:21	201:6,10 202:4	questionable 31:3
102:25 116:11	producing 13:14	propounding	<b>pull</b> 63:21	questionnaire 89:10
117:7 122:2,4	59:5 65:2 77:18	125:12	<b>pulled</b> 198:25 199:3	questions 107:12
132:16 148:1	82:12 96:19	proprietary 8:4,13	pulmonary 85:25	127:23 171:6
149:7 152:25	112:25 117:10	11:23 29:14 37:23	86:13	quick 42:13
153:6,24 156:9	124:1	54:6	punishment 59:11	quickly 41:15 42:9
158:5,6 162:8	<b>product</b> 8:7 9:14	prosecute 134:21	<b>pure</b> 184:24 199:21	42:17 72:6,14
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	1

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 225 of 233 PageID: 48260

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

	I	I	ı	ī
81:16 190:17	72:8 75:10 78:6	reference 133:5	114:2 124:20	178:25
198:2 204:13,14	83:23,24 106:23	201:24	164:16 165:4	representations
204:15	111:11 136:5	references 140:5	reliance 71:20	133:6 147:1
quiet 156:11	148:13 151:17	referral 8:12 30:12	relied 96:1,2 131:2	152:21
quill 116:17	162:21 164:15	38:6 39:13 48:21	131:24 135:15	representative 84:7
<b>Quinn</b> 2:22 5:8,9,11	167:2 168:9	48:25 49:4,9,12	144:16 151:15,22	84:11,12 109:2,7
quote 8:8 101:13	169:14 204:13,24	91:16	152:1,11	109:22 110:16,19
109:9 192:16	rear 120:11	referrals 32:18	relief 109:10,13,14	110:20 115:8
quote/unquote	reason 18:24 23:4,8	referred 30:20,23	109:16,17	130:23 134:8
115:11 117:2	27:15 42:20 64:13	32:10,10 37:21	relieve 123:25	148:10,11 160:22
119:9	66:15 70:9 98:9	115:8 171:16	religion 42:20	160:24
	98:14 108:13	<b>referring</b> 6:13 7:15	relitigate 45:9	representatives
R	113:12 120:24	10:5 20:3 28:16	relitigating 40:12	52:8 70:11 133:9
raise 94:12 96:9	124:13 129:16	32:5,16 38:20	40:18 41:5	133:15,18 138:3
raised 107:10	166:20 177:18	55:5 65:4,9,17,22	rely 95:15,25 120:3	138:13,25 161:13
117:14 119:3	184:21	66:5 91:10	120:5 134:3	representing 9:3
145:17 187:17	reasonable 8:3	refers 37:19 50:23	relying 54:22 70:4	19:3 43:23
raises 28:16	10:16 32:11	reflect 110:9	124:6	reps 61:5 103:20
raising 74:11 119:7	reasons 141:13	<b>reflected</b> 51:18,19	remain 104:21	138:14,23 139:7
<b>Ralph</b> 146:21	156:22 166:22	53:12 58:2	204:12	reputational 65:21
<b>Ralph's</b> 143:21	188:6	reflects 57:19 58:14	remains 110:12	66:2
146:19 147:4	<b>rebut</b> 174:15 178:19	reformed 75:11	remediable 47:19	request 14:24 15:6
<b>ratio</b> 86:16	rebuttal 165:13	regard 10:9 55:11	remedy 44:19,25	41:19 80:15 83:16
rattled 26:17	recalcitrance 73:3	55:14 90:17	45:1	103:23 139:10
Raymark 50:21	receive 164:24	129:18 134:7	remember 34:16,24	165:18,19,21
re-deposed 159:3	received 6:14,16	182:22	61:1 69:1 83:22	195:21,22 198:2
re-respond 158:23	31:22 34:7 47:6	regarding 10:2	120:12 182:18	requested 7:6 41:12
reach 186:15	53:12 54:11 57:7	108:21 130:25	remind 42:18	80:4 160:1 163:25
reached 62:10 64:8	65:6,6 67:3,9,16	144:20 145:15	162:17	requests 155:15,16
reaching 82:16	70:20 81:12 88:2	regardless 9:12 13:1	reminder 118:24	167:5
reaction 108:11 reactions 187:13	89:7 91:11,12	91:13 107:15	reminding 166:2	require 19:7 21:2
	92:2,4,8,12 103:1	110:15	removed 117:3	required 8:19 99:12
read 19:9 27:16 50:22 56:8 70:23	145:25	registrar 161:8,9,19	reopen 45:14 rep 25:24 29:5	101:25 102:1 <b>requirements</b> 73:19
86:4 148:13,23	receiving 146:25 recited 9:9	<b>Reiley</b> 1:17 88:15 156:11	repeating 102:3	103:15
156:25 162:19,22	recognized 64:24	Reiley's 83:7	repeats 8:21	requires 55:8
162:24 163:8	recommending	reiterate 195:7	replies 7:1 102:18	research 198:24
173:22 193:12	169:10	reject 190:19,22	reply 8:17 104:5	researched 184:25
197:1 199:4	record 10:18 13:21	rejected 19:18 60:4	177:24 179:22	reserves 200:14
201:15	14:14 16:13,14,15	60:6,10 140:1	180:19,21 182:24	resolve 60:19 91:24
reader 198:6	21:5 31:7 41:8	165:18	189:4,8 190:5	resolved 87:13
reading 25:3 53:10	59:9 80:11 83:11	related 67:8 85:23	191:14,18 192:1	121:23 129:15
54:24 85:5 86:15	95:9 110:9 111:15	97:11,25 98:6,22	199:20	respect 6:25 7:4,10
86:16 87:2 94:19	145:3 163:12	106:24 138:10	report 13:14 37:4	11:19 23:23 28:1
154:15 162:18	165:9 170:2 190:4	148:1	95:22 96:13	28:8,24 33:8 34:9
ready 36:19 41:22	194:6 201:6,10	relates 10:5 30:11	167:24	34:15,18 40:8,9
42:17 72:24 185:4	202:2	93:15 96:24	reporter 1:12 27:10	42:25 45:17 68:6
real 128:21	records 20:12 39:8	relational 8:8 11:22	86:3,7 206:5	71:21 73:17 91:14
reality 182:20	39:16 49:15 80:16	18:18 58:5 79:21	reporters 1:22	94:3 100:13
realizes 190:25	146:4,18	relationship 38:11	34:12	101:10,23 102:23
really 9:14 11:1	red 82:20 112:6	relative 206:10,12	reports 12:1 20:12	103:4,8,13 104:14
15:5 23:16 30:2	redacted 88:13	relevance 10:4	31:23 32:2 33:20	104:23,25 105:6,6
34:20 41:6 56:9	reduced 51:23	relevant 8:13 15:3	34:8,10 35:1,11	109:22 110:23
58:18 60:21 61:18	redundant 20:1	77:10 86:11 95:5	35:12 39:23 45:12	111:3 116:7 117:7
68:6 70:22 71:2	refer 38:5 170:1	104:2 112:9 114:1	49:16 58:6 165:8	127:7,22 128:13
L				

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 226 of 233 PageID: 48261

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

				Page 225
	I	1	I	1
128:19 134:2	responsive 126:3,4	174:16 175:8,18	113:10,22 114:18	rulings 10:1 100:16
139:7 143:21	132:2 146:1	177:8 178:24	115:6 117:6,9,24	<b>run</b> 96:16
144:17,19 147:8	147:12 157:2	181:4 183:7	118:4,8,11,18	runs 178:19
147:16 148:23	159:16	189:10 190:7	119:19,24 122:3,6	<b>Ryan</b> 2:13 4:14,14
154:12 158:17,25	rest 100:4 198:22	192:1,17 194:16	122:13,16,20,24	164:2 182:10,13
159:1,23 181:22	restrict 69:9	195:15 197:18	123:6,14,20 124:3	183:6 184:20
183:3 184:7 186:6	restrictions 54:5	198:24 199:23	124:18,24 125:5	185:24 188:18,19
200:23 202:25	173:18	200:5,20 203:14	127:17 128:25	188:23 189:15
respected 94:7	result 7:6 12:4	204:6	130:1,2,9,19	195:5,6,17 199:12
Respectfully 125:2	32:13 79:22	rights 14:10 94:7	132:20,24 133:2,9	199:18,21,25
184:20	100:18 166:16	165:6 181:21,23	133:13 134:2,17	200:3,20 202:6
respecting 94:23	183:19	rise 119:11 155:19	135:24 137:5	
respects 149:1	results 114:3	rises 119:14	142:22 143:2,5,7	S
respond 78:17	retain 55:25	risk 178:18	143:9,12,16,19	safe 99:24
108:18 110:22	retained 147:4	RIVERA-SOTO	144:2,5,11,14	sailed 33:23
122:6 126:1,16	retaining 167:22	1:16	145:2,17 146:2,6	sales 146:20
127:10,12 149:1	retreading 135:8	road 1:23 141:14	146:10,14 147:19	Samson 165:19
155:9 159:22	reversed 23:6	179:16	147:25 149:13	173:18 182:17,18
174:5 178:10,12	review 16:6,8 21:23	<b>Robert</b> 1:12 2:13	150:6 151:14,18	190:1
180:23 198:13	34:1 73:8 94:10	4:14 206:4,18	151:23 152:14	sanction 51:11
204:14	164:9 165:12,18	ROBERTO 1:16	153:1,5,11,22	126:23 127:3
responding 108:2	165:20 170:22	ROBINSON 2:20	154:3,6,13,25	sanctioned 126:25
122:5 127:10	178:25 189:6	role 168:12	156:8,12,24	sanctions 72:25
128:11 135:4	194:23 201:8,25	Roman 162:18	157:13 159:12	126:6
response 5:25 28:20	202:2,23	Rooker-Feldman	160:18,23 161:9	satisfactory 127:4
29:16 40:25 42:9	reviewed 31:22	44:13,18,21	161:12,18,21	satisfied 119:13
42:13 80:15	33:12,18,25 39:8	room 36:22 42:3	162:1,5,9 196:9	satisfy 58:21 65:1
104:12 105:4	135:16 201:9	115:23 158:15	Roth's 63:22	73:19
106:7 111:7 119:1	202:20	184:16	Rothenberg 15:23	sauce 8:18,18 59:21
119:8 125:13,13	reviews 169:1	root 21:11	22:23 23:3,7,17	59:21 116:12
130:20 131:5,18	revisit 126:5	Roseland 2:12	69:24 74:23,23,24	save 6:22 75:9 123:9
135:25 137:8,13	<b>right</b> 5:21 14:9,15	Rosenblit 117:18	139:5 150:11	160:2
138:7,8 139:23	15:8,16 17:8	<b>Roth</b> 2:2,5 4:9,9	round 172:11	saying 7:3 14:5
142:24 143:16	19:20 21:4,6 26:8	22:20,21 23:10,14	<b>RPC</b> 15:24 16:25	16:10 31:2,9
147:6,11 150:19	26:11,20 27:22	27:18,23 28:9,13	17:7	32:15 34:13 35:5
150:22 151:3	28:11 30:5 33:14	28:15,23 29:3	rubber 141:13	39:1 71:3 77:12
152:15 153:17	33:23 34:18 36:6	38:5,12,13,17,19	rule 7:24 17:5 53:18	77:15 107:14
157:10 159:23	41:15 43:4,9 44:9	39:2 40:9,16,18	53:20,25 54:1,4	113:8 114:17
170:17 178:12	44:10 50:15 55:20	41:3 47:12,13	54:18,21 60:9	132:9 134:18
186:13	63:23 68:16,18	62:13,14,16,24	80:1 89:20 92:16	141:4,5 148:12
responses 28:17	73:21 76:3,8 79:9	63:4,7 64:1,11	103:15 104:10	149:11 152:2,11
103:7,24 105:11	81:17 82:5 84:8	65:22 66:13 74:10	107:3,23 112:21	163:13 169:13
105:14 106:10,11	87:15 93:12 94:2	75:7 78:15,16,20	115:24,25 118:25	172:18 181:8
109:21 125:9	95:5 98:2,20 99:2	78:24 79:3 81:25	125:10,14 131:7	196:11 197:1
127:18 130:16	111:13,20 113:5	82:5,25 83:3,6,11	173:7 192:25	198:15
131:15 132:15	118:14 121:1	83:18,22 84:5,9	197:19	says 8:12,17,22
134:19 143:1,13	122:24 123:2,6	85:9,17,22 87:8	ruled 10:14 55:12	15:14 23:7 35:2
144:18 148:12	124:18,23 133:13	87:15,22 89:10,14	191:3	44:21 45:16 50:18
151:23 152:3	134:11 135:10	89:21 90:3 96:8	rules 16:24 46:7	54:1,5 62:11
154:14,17 156:25	145:9 146:12,14	97:5,9,11,14,17	56:10 115:25	68:10 95:22
158:20,23,25	147:19 151:12,19	97:24 108:4,7,11	126:14 127:5	101:25 102:10
159:25 201:22	153:5 154:15	108:16,20,25	150:25 157:9	103:2 104:5
responsibilities 22:4	160:23 161:2,20	109:5,25 110:3,6	179:19	107:23 109:8
Responsibility 46:7	162:7 168:9 170:2	110:9 111:2,11,19	ruling 7:10 10:2	116:1 123:5
responsible 109:11	170:8,16 171:12	112:20,22 113:2,5	139:24 194:4,5	132:22 135:25
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 227 of 233 PageID: 48262

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

				Page 226
136:4 140:11	85:14,15 88:2,3	service 90:5,5,6,7,18	shipped 90:22	six 58:17 61:4 70:10
141:5,24 152:23	seconds 141:9	set 8:21 56:11 61:11	shoes 84:13	106:25 109:22
152:24 153:6,15	142:21	77:15 100:9,10,13	<b>short</b> 20:25 79:2	110:16,23 138:2
157:1 166:21	secret 7:15 8:23	100:23 101:10,18	100:20 121:2	138:25 139:6
167:6 168:8	37:14,16,17,18,20	101:24 102:7,17	shortcoming 186:12	140:9 150:7
173:23 175:15	37:21 54:6 65:13	102:24 103:4,6,9	shortcut 190:8	184:22
179:13 183:8	91:18 164:14,15	104:6,14,19	shortly 41:10	<b>skilled</b> 156:19
191:14 192:16	165:1 195:25	105:22,25 106:23	shot 36:24 75:23	slash 141:12
<b>SBMT</b> 87:25	196:11 201:17	108:18 109:2	76:9,14 181:18	slew 158:7
scanned 20:5 25:22	see 10:5,12 15:5	111:21 122:1,11	193:16	<b>slightly</b> 139:16
29:11	22:6,9 40:6 52:3	128:19,22,25	show 9:15 22:24	slippery 93:3
scary 11:2	54:22,23 65:12	129:3,4,8,13,14	85:6 152:7 156:20	<b>slope</b> 93:3
scenario 136:1	67:7,25 99:10	129:17 156:25	showing 29:24,25	slower 86:6
schedule 100:1	108:8,9,11 117:6	157:10 158:20	30:2 31:19 35:13	slowly 83:9
102:17	125:14,25 126:2	159:15 160:2,4	187:21	small 40:21
scheduling 6:25	128:5 140:4	170:4,14 172:14	<b>shown</b> 18:17,22,23	<b>smaller</b> 162:15
102:17	167:16 175:11	182:21 185:20	side 26:13,18 28:2	smart 121:22
scheme 77:9 130:13	179:3 187:12	199:1 206:8	36:18 55:3 72:12	smiling 110:10
school 77:4 141:15	191:13 198:1	sets 100:7	73:24,25 95:2	smoked 88:25
141:19 195:15	201:2	settle 26:14 105:5	120:4 137:11	smoking 21:14 89:2
<b>Schultz</b> 133:25	seek 25:13 51:10	139:19 141:13	155:25 174:15,16	89:3
science 87:1	71:13 93:15 94:10	156:22	177:22 199:4	social 6:22
scientific 114:3	104:10 124:21	settled 33:17 39:20	203:11	software 11:23
<b>scope</b> 60:5 61:12,13	201:8	46:23 98:12 147:9	side's 73:16	13:12
80:4 139:25	seeking 71:1 101:11	187:20	sideshow 47:24	sold 21:18
scores 77:10	167:16	<b>settlement</b> 6:15 10:3	sign 159:6,7,8	solely 186:12
scoring 166:3	seeks 101:18 102:8	10:13 20:3 34:9	signed 203:17	somebody 15:12
screening 168:14	104:1,8	44:11 45:12,22	significant 11:14	21:2 23:21 39:21
scriveners 116:17	seen 29:1 30:14	46:1,9,14,18,21	19:1	47:6 57:9 84:13
seal 46:14 164:13	35:20 69:12 70:17	46:24 47:3,8	<b>signing</b> 161:1,13	88:25 136:7 137:5
190:3 193:3	74:23 167:20	85:13 91:12 92:3	silence 74:13	141:6 144:9
200:17	173:6 178:20,22	92:9,13 94:25	silica 64:10	160:22,24 167:5
sealing 190:1	203:8	95:19 105:1	similar 11:23 86:20	179:1 183:23
199:22 200:5	select 139:3	settlements 45:20	93:15 140:18	somebody's 62:14
search 25:23 90:24 90:24 113:17	<b>selected</b> 11:7 57:19 <b>selection</b> 57:23	46:2 66:7,10	144:22	158:3 166:23 177:18
133:22	self-evident 90:7	67:13,13 69:15 91:6 94:20 95:12	simple 18:22 115:21 190:10	
searchable 20:5	send 78:24 159:9	138:5	simply 12:16 18:12	something's 200:17 soon 136:16 161:24
29:13	sending 201:3	settling 145:15	18:15 47:15 51:13	sorry 5:15 17:11
searching 81:19	senior 2:24 5:18	SEV 86:2	183:12	34:22 42:23 52:24
second 6:13 31:21	sense 84:2,12,13	seven 42:19,21	single 18:5 20:5	63:4 80:21 82:7
39:7 40:1 54:3	126:8 174:18	73:14 104:20	104:24 198:25	84:23 99:9 113:22
88:15 92:1 100:10	sent 32:19 34:19	184:22	203:20,25	118:7 122:3 129:7
101:10,18,24	42:9 49:12 78:18	shake 184:17	single-space 162:19	146:6 147:11
102:7 103:4,6,9	81:13 89:11 101:4	shaking 68:14	Single-spaced	178:3 181:7 187:2
104:6,23 105:22	separate 18:2 43:25	shame 147:13	162:23	194:18
105:24 106:23	145:18 164:7	shared 204:15	sink 126:22	sort 13:14 24:10,14
108:18 111:21	separated 86:8	shaved 27:19 38:7	sir 82:25 83:11 84:9	49:3 55:13 58:5
121:25 122:11	separately 43:24	157:13	108:16	70:8 71:2 166:8
126:24 128:25	Sergeant 133:24	sheet 59:15	sit 42:14 74:12	172:19 200:13
129:2,8,13 130:13	serious 157:17	sheets 91:2	119:24 133:24	sorts 71:20 112:9,9
137:3 140:5 141:5	183:16	<b>shields</b> 149:13	160:14	sought 19:25 101:21
143:23 159:15	serve 103:24 149:21	<b>shifted</b> 112:13	site 90:9	104:5 113:11,18
160:4 186:4	served 115:9	<b>ship</b> 33:22 90:18,18	sitting 75:1 156:11	113:24 114:9,15
secondary 84:21	serves 163:25	90:19,20,21,23	<b>situation</b> 117:16,19	soul 198:10
		l		

### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 228 of 233 PageID: 48263

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

				Page 227
22 22 22 22	76.00.05.77.0.01	1,001,001,1,010,0		1
source 32:22 38:23	76:22,25 77:3,21	160:16,21 161:2,6	<b>Square</b> 2:3	story 77:20
39:14 48:21 49:1	77:25 78:9,23	161:11,16,20,23	staff 202:22 203:5,6	straighten 24:17
49:4,9,12 152:18	79:1,15 80:12,21	162:2,7,10 163:2	stages 66:9	25:8
154:21 199:7	81:4,14,17,23	163:5,16 165:8	stake 19:8 154:12	strangely 159:11
sources 8:13 30:16	82:3,23 83:1,4,7	167:22 168:5,19	stand 87:7 136:14	strategized 181:16
38:11	83:14,21,25 84:6	168:20,25 169:4	standard 119:14,17	<b>Street</b> 1:11 2:3,8 3:3
Southern 3:10	84:10,23 85:2,7	169:10,13,18,21	120:18 125:15	3:6
<b>Spahr</b> 1:11,14	85:11,20,24 86:24	170:3,6,9,14	179:12,13 180:12	strong 41:13
speak 27:20,22	87:3,10,16,24	171:1,8,11,15,20	181:21,24 188:4,5	strongly 27:13
47:23 48:10 74:6	88:8,11,17 89:6	171:25 172:18,24	188:8,11 189:4	stuck 19:23
79:12 106:19	89:12,18 90:1,4	173:1,4,9,13,16	standards 85:5	studies 114:4
114:7 143:5	91:7 93:5,17,21	174:4,6,11,19	standing 84:13	stuff 56:18 120:7
speaking 138:2	93:24 94:14 95:4	175:2,8,22 176:1	standpoint 199:22	148:13 156:2
speaks 64:4	95:24 97:3,6,13	176:9,13,22 177:6	stark 128:6	170:1,10 201:25
special 1:17 4:1,20	97:16,19 98:1	177:11,16,21	start 6:4,6 19:17,19	sub 132:2
4:25 5:4,7,10,15	99:13,17,19,22	178:25 179:6,9,20	72:24 77:17 86:4	<b>subject</b> 7:24 8:6
5:19 9:6,17 11:16	100:2,7 101:5,8	179:25 180:3,8,14	90:6 95:21 149:5	46:15 53:18 54:17
12:3,17,22 13:3	106:1,5,13 107:24	182:1,5,8 183:5	180:7 189:6 198:6	68:1 69:15 70:16
13:17,23 14:1,4	108:2,5,9,14,17	183:22,23 184:1	198:20 199:5	83:18 89:20 92:9
14:11 16:1,9,12	108:23 109:1,6	185:23 187:4,8	started 84:19 89:1	92:16 93:18 101:3
17:4,11,14,16	110:2,5,7,14	188:9,17,20,23	90:11,14,17	173:17
18:7,16,21 19:12	111:10,13,20	189:8,14,16,19	starting 4:4	submission 8:22
20:24 21:6,8 22:9	112:18,24 113:3,8	190:5,9,18 191:11	state 31:13 44:20	67:2 129:9 164:7
23:1,11,21 24:3,5	113:20 114:16,22	191:17,21,24	66:22 85:8 90:11	164:13 165:11,12
24:9,13,17,23	115:13,17,20	192:7,10,21 193:4	92:22 103:23	165:20 167:8
25:6,18 26:4,10	117:5,23 118:2,6	193:7,10,15,20	121:14 127:14	170:17 171:13,23
27:3,8 28:7,10,14	118:10,13 119:2	194:7,10,14,19	165:8,9 166:17	172:3 176:2,23,25
28:19,22 29:2,19	119:21 120:2	195:2,5,14,18,24	173:17	185:12 190:13,14
30:1,6,9,18 31:9	121:21 122:4,9,15	196:3,6,17,23	stated 165:17	190:15
31:16 32:4,7,14	122:18,21 123:4,7	197:3,7,10,20	statement 70:6	submissions 5:23
33:2,4,6,9,14 34:4	123:10,13,19,22	198:12,18 199:17	statements 98:9,15	67:1 195:10 200:8
35:15,19 37:10,15	124:10,16,23	199:20,24 200:11	states 1:1 20:21	submit 19:1 22:5
37:24 38:3,7,14	125:3,6 127:22	200:21 202:7,12	98:4 100:14	77:9 110:12 124:4
38:25 39:18 40:14	129:2,7,12,20,24	202:16 203:19,24	101:11	159:6 164:9
40:17,20 41:9	130:3,18 132:16	204:11,19 205:1,9	stating 164:14	165:23 169:24
43:3,17,21 44:6	132:21 133:4,12	<b>specific</b> 6:10 58:6	statute 7:8 66:15	177:4 178:17
44:14 46:17,20	133:14 134:13	152:20 165:10,22	stay 158:15 179:2,7	185:10 191:5
47:1,4,10,18,25	136:11 137:1,9,12	specifically 73:16	203:14	193:11 194:22
48:4,14 49:2,10	137:18,21,25	79:6 92:17 147:2	<b>stayed</b> 157:16	198:23 199:19
49:20,23 50:2,7	138:6,11,16,21	164:25	stead 133:20	submits 167:7
50:10,13,16,24	139:5,12 140:14	specifics 30:11	Steinmetz 29:8	submitted 20:12
51:7,22 52:4,9,11	140:17 141:1,8,11	<b>spend</b> 14:12 100:22	stenographic 1:10	24:14 53:13 88:1
52:15,23 54:21	141:18,21 142:5	159:20	206:6	100:19 143:4
55:2,6,15,18 56:5	142:20,25 143:5,7	<b>spoke</b> 29:4 133:5	step 169:15 176:7	subpoena 55:8
56:17 57:12,15	143:11,14,18,25	spoken 29:3	185:10 194:3	149:18
58:10,16,24 59:4	144:3,8,13 145:9	spoliating 119:20	steps 145:23	subsequent 100:15
59:7,10,14,24	146:5,8,11 147:16	<b>spoliation</b> 119:14,17	stick 68:22 120:20	subset 13:15
60:12 61:8,25	147:21 148:3	121:17	Stokes 1:23	substance 96:6
62:4,6,11,14 63:2	149:18 150:2	<b>spot</b> 62:15,17	stole 59:24	159:2,10 183:15
63:5,10,19,23	151:6,10,17,19	<b>spouse</b> 131:11	stone 43:8 77:16	183:16
64:3 65:8 67:15	152:17 153:4,9,20	spouting 136:8	stop 17:14 112:18	substantive 22:14
68:5,14,19,22	153:23 154:4,9,19	spreadsheet 11:18	120:7 157:12	105:9 139:22
70:22 71:9,23	154:23 155:1	12:2,5,23,24	168:20 175:22	145:13 187:18,25
74:8,19 75:13,16	156:10,13 157:11	13:14 18:13,15,23	<b>stopped</b> 89:2,3	substitute 131:13
75:19 76:1,5,16	157:15 159:14	51:23 79:23	196:24	161:14
		l	I	I

## Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 229 of 233 PageID: 48264

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

•				Page 228
	l		l	1
substituted 131:12	23:12 27:23 43:17	97:12,25 98:5,5,9	tells 179:1	199:6
160:10,11,24	47:18 55:1 65:23	98:9,11,11,15,15	template 166:17	think 8:25 9:9,23,24
substitution 105:15	76:22 79:20,22	112:10 123:16	tendered 136:17	10:15,19 13:8
160:17 161:24	80:3 94:14 102:14	132:9 146:21,24	<b>tension</b> 135:19	17:1,2,6 22:1,7,17
subtext 71:3	111:14 116:20	147:1	term 49:11 109:19	22:21 23:14 24:21
<b>success</b> 130:12	120:16 129:3	tales 195:15	109:20 161:7	25:6,9 26:5 27:21
successor 113:17	151:20 152:10	talk 29:12 31:21	164:14 165:2	30:1 35:15 36:10
sued 20:19 43:24	164:5 173:19	64:20 65:3 80:7	195:25	37:17 39:12 52:13
81:11	180:3 184:15	111:22 142:17	terms 13:4,24 23:17	52:16,17 53:21
suffered 98:13	188:17 198:18	151:14 188:15,18	26:14 39:13 68:8	55:2 58:22 59:22
<b>suffers</b> 147:25	199:12	188:24 189:12,14	169:2 188:12	60:2,10,17,18,20
sufficient 25:10	surprise 34:14	204:6	191:13	60:24 63:14 64:21
103:7	76:20 81:10 98:25	talked 22:12 96:19	terrible 25:8	66:7,9 69:4 70:19
suggesting 76:15	surprised 157:1	147:25 165:24	territories 98:4	71:5 76:13 77:14
96:17	159:3 203:11	176:15	test 32:24 75:23	78:9 79:13 88:16
suggestion 74:4	surrogate 160:25	talking 22:14,15,16	86:1,13 123:23	88:18 89:16 94:9
suggests 104:15	161:3	22:22 23:12 25:21	136:7	94:15,22 95:9,17
165:7	Surrogate's 161:6	25:22 27:25 28:11	testify 133:3 134:9	96:22 100:25
<b>Suite</b> 1:15,23 2:3	survive 30:17	50:14 60:22 71:22	136:19	103:3 105:18
summaries 56:9	surviving 131:11	93:19 100:23	testifying 57:9	106:1,20 107:20
summarized 57:6	sustained 98:5	103:9 113:6	136:12	108:5 110:1 117:1
105:19	SVC 86:2	133:10 144:25	testimony 111:6	120:1,17,18,19,24
summary 10:15	swamp 120:10,13	145:4,5,14 159:2	146:23	123:2 125:10,11
48:20 56:10,12,13	120:14	187:15	thank 5:1,5,6 30:5	126:8 127:3
56:14 121:16	swords 149:12	<b>TATE</b> 1:22,22	40:16 48:19 52:23	128:24 135:23
<b>Sunday</b> 165:15	sympathetic 77:22	teacher 119:4	68:19 81:4 94:11	137:23 138:17,17
166:2	synthesis 17:25 18:3	technical 156:9	99:18,23 100:5	139:15 142:15
superb 27:9	system 157:23	teed 36:18 185:18	123:13 159:14	144:5 154:9,24
supplement 100:15		telephone 82:10	162:9 198:11	155:21,22 156:22
supplemental	T	184:16	199:10 202:6	159:19 162:10
143:12	T 2:22	TELEPHONIC	205:5	166:2,9 168:4
supplemental/ame	tact 166:14	2:19 3:1	<b>Thanks</b> 99:25	169:2,6,18 172:7
104:19	tainted 32:18,22,23	tell 11:16 23:22 33:3	theme 59:20 60:1	172:7 176:4 177:2
supplemented	38:24 39:4,11,14	38:18 40:20 41:22	theory 107:12,17	177:7,13 181:24
104:16	39:15	42:1 43:21 56:5	thereof 165:22	182:14 184:12,19
supplied 21:25	take 10:17 12:23	56:25 71:6 72:17	thing 26:12 44:17	185:1,3,5,13,19
<b>support</b> 32:11 36:17	22:4,5 27:10	72:22 77:18 79:6	53:3 59:6 80:11	185:21 186:1,5,17
45:12 101:14	30:12 37:3 41:14	79:9 80:19 81:1	90:16,17,20 93:3	187:15,19 188:6
147:4,5 196:16	43:7 47:4 59:12	82:4 83:1 94:1	96:23 102:4	188:14 190:11,19
<b>supported</b> 15:22,24	66:8 76:9 79:2	105:16 112:20	105:20 122:25	190:21,23,25
103:20 196:21	83:8 86:6 100:3	116:19 121:3,18	128:18 140:4	191:5,8 192:19,24
Suppose 15:12	118:16 128:18,21	124:5 125:21,24	142:14 152:24	194:8,12,15
supposed 41:11,17	131:25 136:14	128:7,13 129:13	153:12 157:10	200:25 201:19
80:14 107:5	151:7 157:3	132:5 155:10	160:19 163:11	202:10,18
179:17 182:23	162:22 171:4	157:16 158:6	171:9,11,22	thinking 96:21
197:12	175:6,7 189:16	166:8 177:8	193:10,23 195:6	thinks 189:4
supposedly 64:18	191:15 198:9	178:24 184:25	204:1,20	third 2:15 33:22
71:14 136:5	203:8	188:2 191:11	things 6:10 9:1	40:1,11 44:22
140:23	taken 1:11 20:13	192:1 195:14	26:17 28:5 31:15	45:8,18 57:22
<b>Supreme</b> 179:2	29:6 93:13 118:20	198:4	32:12 65:4 68:3	65:7,11 67:2 77:5
202:8,19,20 204:2	206:7	telling 12:22 20:25	68:17 77:15 78:16	94:20 101:14
sur-reply 180:16,24	takes 77:20 152:19	70:5 87:1 116:9	82:1,15 107:5	102:5 104:25
189:11 191:15,24	187:12 200:13	120:22 140:22	115:11 125:7	175:14 176:16,16
192:3	talc 68:25 69:3 88:9	156:21 176:7	142:17 168:16	176:17 179:12,13
sure 5:17 17:15 21:9	88:10,19,20,20,22	181:4	170:21,21 174:18	181:12,19 182:22
3410 3.11 11.13 21.7	55.15,17,25,20,22	101.1	1,0.21,211/4.10	101.12,17 102.22
	I	I	1	1

# Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 230 of 233 PageID: 48265

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

				Page 229
195.9 100.0 10	197:18 204:7	transom 202:1	107:20	24:7 26:4 27:12
185:8 188:8,10 191:2 192:15	197:18 204:7 206:7	transom 202:1 transport 90:21,23	twice 5:20 60:10	27:14 28:19 30:18
Thomas 2:17	timeline 106:17	transport 90:21,23 trash 35:24	twice 5:20 60:10	32:15 36:9,11
thorough 22:8	timely 55:7		two 2:3 5:21 27:10	·
	times 48:22 60:7	tread 189:25		37:2,24 39:1 40:4 46:10 53:5 55:12
thought 11:2 22:11 28:25 43:16 44:24		treat 159:4	28:5 40:21 41:13	46:10 53:5 55:12
	162:18 168:18	treatment 118:15 193:21	41:16,23 42:19	61:10 71:23,24 77:17 78:8 89:16
50:24 69:25 70:5	timing 107:21 111:3 165:24	trial 42:17 100:1	48:10,15 53:17 57:3 61:15 66:7,8	93:6 94:5 120:9
97:19 98:2 102:14	tire 31:14 45:3			
113:22 124:14 129:14 171:6	70:15 75:20,21	111:6 121:8 132:19,22 136:12	66:9 68:3 71:4	120:10 123:3 127:20 130:5
I .	tires 177:5	136:13 165:5	72:1 74:16 78:16	
172:4 174:7 176:4 177:5 185:1	tit-for-tat 120:7		88:9 97:23 98:25 100:7 102:15	131:25 134:22
198:16	TLC 86:2,16	tricky 166:12 tried 65:5 94:6	100:7 102:15	148:3 149:6,7 154:8 162:14
thoughts 13:21 thousand 118:14	today 9:2 13:18	112:1 121:3 122:18	136:2 142:22,23	169:22 174:20,20
	16:16 41:11,16,23		144:25 145:24	179:8 196:10
172:8 193:21	71:7,10,14,15	tries 168:7 trifocals 162:21	160:4,9,14 163:23	198:19 199:13
thousands 39:20,23	76:11,11 91:9		186:2 197:21	understanding
121:5	98:25 102:14,15	<b>triggered</b> 163:12 164:11	two-step 167:2	11:21 49:19 51:17
three 6:10,15 9:24	105:25 160:14 163:14,15,16,17		typical 58:12 130:4	51:25 53:10 140:24 143:22
39:22 48:12,15 60:23 61:18 64:13	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	trip 99:24 trouble 162:11,18	183:21,22	140:24 143:22 147:3 182:2
	163:18 166:6 177:2,13 185:4,5	191:1	U U	189:23
64:14,14,20 65:3	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	troubled 186:10	ultimate 36:6,25	189:23 understands 78:10
67:12 71:15 75:9	193:18 205:6		ultimate 30:0,25 ultimately 42:4 50:5	168:13
79:8,25 80:6	token 36:13 told 18:9 22:13 26:5	troubling 184:14	unbecoming 120:8,8	understood 49:3
81:11 91:8,14		true 17:4 50:10		50:3 68:12 153:1
106:19,20 115:9 129:5 180:1	26:8 40:21,22 44:17 70:3,23	65:18 67:25 97:9 97:10 144:18	uncertainty 95:18 194:25	186:13
190:11 194:21	72:19 83:23	206:6	unchanged 104:22	unfair 96:22 180:11
190:11 194:21	117:17 130:22	truly 189:23	unchanged 104:22 unclear 55:21	Unfiled 87:20
threshold 164:18	132:7 152:6,12,23	truny 189:23 trumps 17:7	undefined 106:12	unfortunately 11:11
threshold 164:18 throw 35:23 45:4	152:7 152:6,12,25	trumps 17:7 trust 6:15 10:11	106:14	88:13
118:6 126:21	181:13,17,19	47:8 50:20 51:5	underlying 10:6	unique 170:14
throwing 117:25	186:25 187:9	67:2,3 91:12 92:3	31:23 33:11,20,24	United 1:1 20:20
throwing 117:25 thrown 108:6	Tom 140:12 141:6	92:9,13 168:9	43:14,25 44:8	98:4
thumb 125:10	tomorrow 175:13	trusts 47:22 50:6	48:24 51:12,14	98:4 universe 27:24
thumb 123:10 thunder 59:24	199:17,18	66:11,14,18,25	52:18 101:22	unnecessary 47:24
Tick-tock 141:11	tone 14:6	67:9,10,20	109:19,20 114:10	103:10 164:15
tie 152:20	tonight 175:12	try 14:4,5 45:6 51:1	135:10 140:20	165:4
tights 118:11	TORTORELLA	51:11 60:23 78:13	155:8	unpack 41:4 118:9
time 11:1 14:12 15:3	3:9	80:3,5,8 83:25	underneath 87:11	unprecedented 11:1
16:6,15 22:11	total 31:11 94:20	120:15 123:9	underscore 87:4,5,5	unquote 8:9 101:13
31:14 41:14 43:1	95:1 196:19	155:24 157:20	87:17,17,18,18,18	unredacted 6:22
43:22 50:19,25	totally 20:1 47:24	158:15 168:2	87:25 88:2,2,3,3,4	unrelated 150:14
60:12 64:17 72:12	touchdown 166:4	177:9	88:19,19,21,21,24	unrestricted 163:24
72:17 76:3 80:9	trace 32:20	trying 19:15 25:7,9	88:24 89:1,2,3,7,7	unscramble 148:6
81:21 97:8 100:23	trade 7:15 8:23	25:18 45:8 75:22	90:4,5,5,6,6,7,8,8	upset 44:18 113:10
102:13 106:12	37:14,15,17,18,20	77:23 78:6 96:22	90:9,9,10,10,11	113:12,16,24
116:18 124:22	37:21 54:6 65:13	120:14 149:12	90:11,12,12,13,13	113.12,10,24
132:6 148:8,15	91:18	150:23 158:1	90:13,14,14,15,15	use 13:10 45:6
151:1 155:13	training 90:8,9,10	188:3,22 189:1	90:16,18,19,19,20	49:10 56:12 59:15
156:15,21 157:5	transcript 1:10	194:19	90:21,21,23,23,24	70:8 80:9 81:21
159:20 167:8	27:16 89:22 206:6	turn 15:21 16:22	90:25,25 94:20	95:19 125:15
176:11,20 181:11	transcripts 115:12	17:23 30:15	understand 12:17	127:2 155:19
186:14 190:14	translation 30:7	turned 19:2 77:8	14:3 16:12,18	165:2
192:3 196:21	transmitted 155:25	turns 34:11 107:1	17:12,16,17 23:12	usual 75:6
172.3 170.21	transmitted 133.23	turns 57.11 107.1	17.12,10,17 23.12	usuai / J.O
	1	1	1	1

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

				Page 230
ntm oct 194.7		192.2	20.7 11 40 12 10	Widoner 76:00 77 1
<b>utmost</b> 184:7	W	182:3	28:7,11 40:12,18	Widener 76:20 77:1
V	<b>W</b> 2:17	wants 6:21 45:24	41:5,7,18,24 42:4	77:3
	wait 39:21 62:11	64:23 180:20	50:14 51:7 55:24	wife 122:22 123:1,4
v 192:16	70:24 75:3 117:5	190:17	59:2 60:22 61:12	123:11
VA 89:3	162:3	Ware 105:13 143:9	68:22 69:21 70:25	William 1:17 52:9
vacuum 132:18	waiting 27:19	143:12,14,19	71:4,8,12,18,21	Williams 1:3 3:6
vague 152:8	160:20 161:12	145:4,5,11,20	72:9 73:11,12	4:16 40:10,11
valid 51:6,13 75:24	waive 15:10	146:6,8 147:17	74:2 75:3 77:13	109:3,11 140:12
value 34:8 35:1 39:8	waived 92:19,23	148:25 151:21	79:2 84:3,6,10,15	143:3 144:23
variant 125:14	139:25 144:4,7	160:2	84:16,17 93:4	145:7
varies 25:1	148:20 167:11,13	Ware's 158:22	100:22 102:3,10	<b>Williams'</b> 144:23
various 95:11	waiver 55:10,13,21	warned 134:10	103:9,11 105:24	willing 17:1 72:24
verbatim 8:11	92:21 100:17	Washington 2:8 3:3	107:14,17 120:14	83:12,19 159:7,8
verification 153:21	137:14,17 142:14	3:7	121:24 124:7	<b>wills</b> 161:8,10,19
154:5,10 155:3	waiving 15:15	wasn't 16:5 43:2	130:11 133:2,10	win 122:22 181:22
159:6 160:12	127:15	80:20 121:6	138:2,18 144:25	wise 38:20
verified 103:24	walk 59:1 65:15	156:12 203:16	145:4,5 149:12	wish 5:24 8:10
105:14 131:22	wall 168:14	waste 155:12	151:1 153:19	withdrew 98:12
148:12	Walsh 77:4	wasting 156:15	160:12 161:12	withheld 140:2
verify 134:25	want 9:6,8 12:10	watch 156:3	169:23,23 170:3	withhold 65:1 166:6
verifying 153:17	16:14 21:8 23:11	water 78:1	176:15 179:16,18	withholding 64:25
versa 128:10	27:5,23 38:9,14	waving 57:1	182:14 185:7,9	65:17 66:5 67:7
version 82:19	38:15 44:3 46:1	way 12:20 19:10	194:25 196:9	69:18 91:15 142:3
112:15	48:18,20 51:15	32:14,17 34:5	199:15	withstanding
versions 128:3	53:3 54:19 55:2	47:5 51:5 58:18	we've 60:2,15 61:20	122:20
Veterans 89:4	58:18 60:23 61:4	66:24 68:12 71:25	69:11 74:23 113:5	witness 21:23
vetted 39:9	61:5 73:6 75:6	72:3 75:16 82:13	117:9,10,11,17,19	136:16,18 149:15
vice 128:10	79:1,3 80:7,10	82:18 83:8 108:19	130:16 134:19	149:16
victims 113:18	81:23 89:15,22	116:6 118:14	135:5,7,12 144:19	witnesses 132:11
view 92:5 101:2	94:5 96:12 105:16	125:18 126:9	150:24 153:12	146:23
108:12 112:4,4,5	112:15 117:21,24	128:6 136:6,12	154:6 156:4	women 132:5
120:20 127:13	123:5 125:25	153:23 155:6	185:17 187:15	wondered 119:2
128:16 132:1	126:2,7 127:11	167:3,4,25 168:11	191:6 200:22	wonderful 205:3
142:6 158:3 169:2	128:21 130:20	168:16 169:15	weekend 194:25	Woodland 1:15
178:15 195:9	131:25 132:2	172:5 173:18	weeks 41:13,16,23	woods 82:14
200:6 204:12,12	143:8,15 148:14	177:19 183:14,19	71:4 72:1 74:16	word 20:5 25:23
204:15	149:6,7 150:19	185:18 189:21,24	97:23 98:25	29:13 81:19 197:4
viewed 35:21 38:21	152:7,10 153:15	190:8,10 198:8	102:15 106:6,7	197:11
vigorously 61:2	155:23 156:20	201:8,18 205:6	118:16	words 14:2 126:18
Vikings 166:3	157:4 163:1 168:1	ways 133:15 167:19	Welcome 4:25	150:20 179:24
Village 1:23	171:19 173:7,20	168:11	well-established	work 8:7 9:13 10:18
Vince 5:13,17	171.19 173.7,20	we'll 16:21 28:17	175:13	11:13 17:9,19
VINCENT 2:24	173:22,23,23	42:12 59:12 80:2	Wengerd 105:12	19:5,15 27:17
violates 165:5	174:9 177:5 179:2	81:2,3 96:7 101:5	159:1	29:22 34:4 53:16
violating 42:11	181:9,23 184:8	106:2 117:8 122:6	went 16:20 21:12	53:20 54:16 56:3
virtually 20:2	187:14 188:2,17	125:21 143:24	26:1 82:14 134:17	56:6,14,15,19,23
175:14	188:24 190:18	162:8 172:6 175:8	190:1	57:2,6,13 61:20
voice 128:10,10	191:19 192:6,6,19	176:7 184:10	weren't 14:2 22:14	66:5,24 67:6
voir 136:18	194:12 198:8	187:12 190:11	32:12 62:12 193:8	72:19,20 78:10,12
volume 198:25	194:12 198:8	191:13,14 197:18	Whatever's 155:7	80:2 82:13 99:19
199:1,2		197:20 201:22	whatsoever 31:7,12	100:20 146:11
voluminous 56:12	wanted 44:18 75:5	204:5	whiskers 42:22,25	157:19 183:5
voluntarily 98:12	94:17 96:13,18	we're 9:11 11:11	whitish/gray 146:24	203:4,6
vs 1:5	100:2 106:9 108:8	13:18 23:12 25:20	Whoa 108:5	worked 146:22
	128:5 151:5	25:21 27:25 28:3	whoever's 38:19	worker 31:14 70:15
	173:23 176:4,5	20.2127.2020.0		
	•	•	•	•

Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

				Page 231
worker's 05.12	68:2 73:14 88:3,4	11th 2:15	111:17	
worker's 85:13 Workers 45:3 75:21	90:19,24 97:8	11th 2:15 12 105:3 129:23	<b>2018</b> 1:8 8:16 103:1	4
	*			<b>4</b> 101:24 102:17
working 29:9 57:9	119:7,9 155:11	139:14,17 140:19	104:4,18 116:16	104:1,11 105:1,3
204:18	168:19 184:10,22	141:12 142:24	164:12 166:1	111:23 129:22,24
works 179:18	yellow 81:7	143:10,17 145:5	206:19	137:25 138:1
189:21 201:19	yes/no 47:15,16	145:11,19 147:17	<b>20th</b> 6:24 102:16	158:21,22 159:19
202:3	yesterday 5:5 42:10	147:17 148:24,25	<b>210</b> 1:15	160:1,3
world 16:15 38:10	186:14	158:21,23 160:1,3	<b>220</b> 164:8 171:16	<b>40</b> 97:8 119:9
200:6 201:1	yield 29:17	162:18 163:4,6,7	172:14 187:5	155:11 175:19
worry 181:14	York 2:16	<b>12,000</b> 24:22,25	196:17,19,20,24	<b>415</b> 18:2 52:1,5,6
worse 135:24	Younger 115:22	<b>120</b> 81:11	197:13	<b>437</b> 3:10
worth 132:8 164:8	119:4 141:16	<b>12th</b> 3:6 164:12	<b>23</b> 103:15 104:11	<b>45</b> 53:18,20,25
193:21	193:18	171:12	<b>23rd</b> 100:10	54:18,21
wouldn't 62:25		<b>13</b> 105:7 129:23	<b>24</b> 194:22 195:2	<b>45(d)(2)</b> 54:1
162:2,3 188:24	Z	140:16 143:6	<b>25</b> 44:14 68:2	<b>450</b> 79:10,14 81:10
write 40:23,24 48:8	<b>Z</b> 63:13 136:4 141:5	144:24 145:6	168:19	<b>48th</b> 1:11
157:22 204:22	152:12	147:18 148:24	<b>25th</b> 176:11	
written 147:8	<b>zero</b> 19:19	158:21 160:1	<b>26</b> 7:7 8:14 131:7	5
149:24		<b>14</b> 163:1,5,5,6 166:1	<b>26(a)</b> 107:3,23	<b>5</b> 102:7 103:1,14
wrong 18:13 22:10	0	<b>14th</b> 165:14,15	<b>26th</b> 138:19 176:13	104:10,17 105:6
22:20 31:8 35:14	<b>07068</b> 2:12	<b>15</b> 1:8 6:7 22:17	176:14	121:25 122:10
35:17 37:5 49:3	<b>07102</b> 2:21	99:7	<b>27</b> 7:2,18 102:19	159:21
58:11 80:17,18	<b>07929</b> 3:10	<b>15th</b> 77:14 105:23	<b>278</b> 97:21 98:2	<b>50</b> 125:23
120:25 147:11,12	<b>08002</b> 1:16	105:24	<b>285</b> 99:8	<b>502(d)</b> 7:24 17:5,7
171:23 175:2,10	<b>08055</b> 1:24	<b>16</b> 206:19	<b>286</b> 98:3	58:21 89:20 92:16
182:7		<b>16,000</b> 24:8,19	<b>2900</b> 2:3	171:5
wrongful 134:8	1	<b>1735</b> 1:11	<b>29th</b> 71:11 108:19	<b>520</b> 1:23
wrote 8:11 20:7	<b>1</b> 86:2,15 101:18	<b>18,000</b> 22:18	109:24 122:12	<b>56</b> 2:12
62:25 144:12	103:8 104:7,24	<b>19103</b> 2:4	160:5	5th 128:1
165:1	106:23 107:25	<b>1975</b> 112:16		<b>241</b> 120.1
www.tate-tate.com	108:18 109:8,23	<b>1980</b> 90:25 91:4	3	6
1:25	111:21 117:17	<b>1983</b> 115:12	<b>3</b> 54:4 55:5 90:18	<b>6</b> 102:7 103:14
	128:20,22 129:6	<b>19th</b> 2:21	100:16 102:6	104:10 105:10
X	129:18,22,24,25	<b>1st</b> 77:19	103:13 104:4,10	121:25 122:11
<b>X</b> 37:4,5 63:13	130:3 131:6		121:25 122:10	127:19 159:21
136:4 141:5	137:24 158:21,22	2	159:21	<b>636-8283</b> 1:24
152:12	159:17 160:1,3,3	<b>2</b> 8:13 90:16,20	<b>3:20</b> 205:11	<b>65</b> 163:25 164:5
x-rays 85:5	165:17 166:25	102:6 103:13	<b>30</b> 15:18 16:21	<b>655</b> 2:8 3:3
<b>XI01040</b> 206:19	167:9	104:10 117:21	45:22 61:6 139:3	000 4.0 J.J
	<b>1,800</b> 22:24 23:7,16	121:25 122:10	141:9 150:7	7
Y	23:19	159:21 166:25	<b>300</b> 22:19,24 23:2,7	<b>7</b> 100:11 102:7
<b>Y</b> 63:13 109:10	<b>1.6</b> 60:9	196:3,4,7	23:19	103:14 104:10
136:4 141:5	<b>1.6(a)</b> 15:24 16:25	2:11-cv-01754-JL	<b>32</b> 142:20	105:13 121:25
152:12	17:7	1:2	<b>350</b> 8:9 52:1	122:11 159:21
yeah 52:5 99:25	<b>10</b> 146:3,5,12	<b>2:15</b> 156:3	<b>367</b> 8:15	<b>70</b> 164:3,5
132:25 163:5	172:11	<b>20</b> 34:24 175:19	<b>38</b> 184:10	<b>70</b> 104:3,3 <b>725</b> 3:6
170:12 177:2	<b>10:30</b> 1:12 156:4	200 1:15	<b>383</b> 6:9	<b>75</b> 172:9
187:6 200:2	<b>100</b> 125:24	<b>20005</b> 3:7	<b>384-12</b> 102:22	7 <b>th</b> 111:17
203:17 204:24	<b>1002</b> 115:25	<b>20005-5793</b> 2:8 3:3	<b>390</b> 6:24 102:16	/ <b>ui</b> 111.1/
year 68:8 69:7	<b>10022</b> 2:16	<b>2000</b> 3-3773 2.6 3.3 <b>2001</b> 2:3	<b>394</b> 7:3	8
84:19,19 89:1,1,2	<b>1003</b> 112:21 115:25	<b>2011</b> 10:11	<b>395</b> 7:18	<b>8</b> 102:7 103:14
	10th 77:14	<b>2011</b> 10.11 <b>2015</b> 100:10	<b>396</b> 102:19	
39'/ IIn'In In'/			<b>390</b> 102.19 <b>397</b> 104:4	104:10 121:25
89:2 116:15 136:2 142:13	<b>11</b> 24·21 24 141·12	1 /11 / D: / /: / / X: 1/1		
142:13	<b>11</b> 24:21,24 141:12	<b>2017</b> 6:7 7:2,7 8:14		122:11 159:21
	11 24:21,24 141:12 147:17 148:25 158:22 160:3	99:7 100:12,16 102:19 107:11	398 8:16 3rd 8:16	800 1:24 2:15 80s 118:20

#### Case 2:11-cv-01754-BRM-AME Document 621-11 Filed 07/23/20 Page 233 of 233 PageID: 48268

USDC, District of NJ C.A. No. 2:11-cv-01754-JLL-JAD Williams, et al. v. BASF Catalysts, LLC, et al. Oral Argument

Monday January 15, 2018

		Page 23
<b>856</b> 1:24		
9		
9 143:17		
90 70:12 90s 45:2		
<b>983-8484</b> 1:24		